

STUDENT BODY GRANT

*Presented to the College
by the student body, as
authorized by the Stu-
dent Council of 1934-35.*



2^D

327N



4272
Vol. IV

DISCARDED
THE
UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG
PORTAGE & BALMORAL
WINNIPEG, MAN.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
No Sponsor

PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

HISTORICAL SERIES, No. XLIX

CHAPTERS IN THE
ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY
OF MEDIAEVAL ENGLAND

VOLUME IV

Published by the University of Manchester at
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS (H. M. McKECHNIE, M.A., Secretary)
23 LIME GROVE, OXFORD ROAD, MANCHESTER

CHAPTERS IN THE
ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY
OF MEDIAEVAL ENGLAND

THE WARDROBE, THE CHAMBER
AND THE SMALL SEALS

BY

T. F. TOUT, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.

Honorary Professor of the University

VOLUME IV

MANCHESTER
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1928

SN
309
T55
1920
v. 4.

Accession No.

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER PUBLICATIONS
No. CLXXXIV.

MADE IN ENGLAND
All rights reserved.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IV

CHAPTER X—(Continued)

	PAGES
ADMINISTRATION AND POLITICS UNDER RICHARD II., 1377-1399	I-68
SECTION IV. THE RISE AND FALL OF AUTOCRACY, 1395-1399.	1-68
Transition from constitutional to personal rule, 1. Preliminaries to the French marriage, 1-2. Richard's first visit to Calais, 2-3. His second visit; conclusion of French alliance, 3-5. Consolidation of new royalist party, 5-6. Junior branches of royal family the nucleus of that party, 6-7. The royalist ministers, 7-9. Walden and Lincoln, 7. Stafford and Mone, 7-8. Thomas Arundel, 8-9. Minor personalities, 9-10. Household troops and liveried reserve, 10-11. Bushy, Bagot and Green, 11-12. Their early politics, 12-14. The first parliament of 1397, 14-15. Richard's plans explained to it, 16. Parliament's four complaints, 16-17. Attack on Haxey, 17-19. Honours conferred and disabilities imposed, 19-20. Richard's foreign projects, 20-21. Opposition leads Richard to attack his enemies, 21. Richard's revenge on Gloucester, Arundel and Warwick, 21-22. The <i>concilium juvenile</i> and the new appeal, 22-23. The second parliament of 1397 summoned, 23. Mobilisation of the armed following of king, 23-24. September parliament of 1397; Bushy again Speaker, 24-26. Archbishop Arundel impeached and disgraced, 26. Impeachment of Gloucester, Arundel, Warwick and Mortimer, 26-27. Long honours list; the dukelings, 27-28. Creation of principality of Chester, 28. The adjourned parliament at Shrewsbury, January 1398, 29-32. Quarrel of Hereford and Norfolk, 30-31. Commission of eighteen appointed, 29-31. Richard triumphant, 31-32. His inability to rise to the occasion, 32-33. His uneasiness and restless wanderings, 33-35. Effect of autocracy on administration, 35. The parliamentary commission of eighteen, 35-36. Its specific task, 36-37. Its powers extended beyond its original purpose, and its later meetings, 37-40. Did	

Richard intend to put the commission in the place of parliament ? 40-41. Richard's use of household offices, 41-42. Local administration, 42-43. His attitude to the reappointment of sheriffs, 43-44. Extension of jurisdiction of prerogative courts, 44-45. Creation of a standing army, 45-46. Financial policy of the king, 46-47. The chronicler's stories of the exactions, 48. Officers of state and household support the king, 48-50. Public opinion and the king's ministers, 50-51. Richard's distrust of his advisers, 51. The bureaucratic council, 51-52. Seizure of Lancaster estates on death of John of Gaunt, 52-53. Preparations for a second visit to Ireland, 53-54. Who accompanied the king to Ireland, 54-55. Provisions made for government in England, 55-56. Henry of Lancaster's bid for his inheritance, 56-57. Attempts of regency to grapple with the situation, 57-58. Richard advised to return, 58. Regency's submission to Lancaster ; capture of Bristol, 58-59. Richard's return, 59-60. Salisbury's failure and Richard's capitulation, 60-61. Desertion of Richard by administration, and his abdication, 61-62. General submission of old ministers to new king, 62-63. Henry's moderation, 63-64. Significance of revolution of 1399, 64-65. Unbroken administrative progress, 65-66. Point of view of permanent officials, 66. Weakness of executive, 66-67. Royal policy in fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, 67. Old machinery readjusted, in fifteenth century, to meet new needs, 67-68.

CHAPTER XI

THE WARDROBE OF THE HOUSEHOLD UNDER EDWARD III., 1377-1399 1327-1377,

69-185

Relative influence of the pre-regnal households of Edward II. and Edward III. after their accession, 69. Early household of Edward of Windsor, 69-71. Its chief officers, 71-72. Additions to Edward's appanage, 72-73. Effect on his staff ; Cusance and Huggate, 73-74. Association between Edward's household and king's other children, 74-75. The joint wardrobe of Edward and Isabella, 75. The wardrobe of Edward III., 75-76. Wodehouse's transference to exchequer, 76. His successors as keeper : Bury and Garton, 76-77. Robert Tawton, 77-78. William Cusance, 78-79. Richard Ferriby, 79. Examples of official promotion, Norwell and Beche, 79-81. Stewards of the household, 81-82. Chamberlains, 82-83. Wardrobe records before and after 1337, 83. Evasion of restrictions upon the wardrobe, 84. Exchequer the ultimate source of supplies, 85. The wardrobe and the bankers,

85-86. Temporary eclipse of the Poles ; replaced by Bardi,	
87-88. Return of Poles ; rival firms of Florentine bankers,	
88-89. Increasing dependence of king on Poles, 89-90. Audit	
of long-standing accounts, 90-94. Accounts of Droxford,	
Wodehouse, Benstead and Northburgh, 90. Audit of	
Waltham's account, 91-92. Exchequer treatment of accounts	
in arrears, 92-93. Final settlement, 93-94. Audit of accounts	
for new reign, 94-96. Effect of Scottish war on household	
and state offices, 96-97. Various types of wardrobe receipts	
distinguished in accounts, 97-98. Distinction between <i>expensa</i>	
<i>hospicii</i> and <i>expensa forinseca</i> , 98. Development of the	
wardrobe to meet new conditions of the war, 98-100. Beche's	
account, 100-102. Wardrobe in the Netherlands, 102-103.	
Norwell's account, 104-106. The wardrobe under Cusance,	
106-109. Edington succeeds Cusance as keeper, 110-111.	
Edington's receipts and expenses, 111-112. "Course of the	
wardrobe" and effective exchequer control under Edington	
as treasurer, 112-113. Magnates and king jointly responsible	
for finance of campaigns abroad, 113-114. Lengthening of	
term of office in the wardrobe ; types of official, 114-115.	
Surviving wardrobe records for the Crécy-Calais campaign,	
115-116. Wetwang's receipts, 116-117. His expenses, 117-	
118. Wetwang's successor, Thomas Clopton, 119-120. Re-	
vival of reservation of lands for the service of the household,	
120-122. Cusance's re-appointment as keeper, 122. Extension	
of wardship assignments to wardrobe, 122. Definition	
of suitable lands, 123-124. Results of this policy, 124-126.	
Gradual renunciation of the system, 126-127. Reason of	
failure, 127-128. Was the experiment opportunistic, or a	
definite stroke of policy? 128-129. Retirement of Cusance	
and Dalton, 129-130. William Retford, keeper, and his sub-	
ordinates, 130-131. Great wardrobe accountability to ward-	
robe, 132-133. Buckingham made keeper of wardrobe ; his	
account, 133-135. Buckingham's immediate successors as	
keeper ; Retford, 135-136. Walton and Farley, 136-137.	
The controllers, 1353-1359, 137-138. Confusion in accounting	
caused by Walton's death, 138-139. Farley's subordinates,	
139. His colleagues in France, 139-140. Obstacles in way	
of audit of Walton's account, 140-141. Concurrent audit of	
accounts of Farley and Walton, 141-142. Array of Farley's	
account ; a second wardrobe of the household, 142-143.	
Details of Farley's receipts, 143-144. His expenses, 144-146.	
Comparison of household expenses in different periods, 146.	
Dual wardrobe of Farley and Ferriby, 146-147. Examination	
of Ferriby's account, 148-151. Distinction between accounts	
of Ferriby and Farley, 151. Wardrobe loses financial direc-	
tion of war, 151-152. The wardrobe from 1361 to 1377, 152-	
153. Its keepers, 153-156. Its controllers : Segrave, Ypres,	

Street, 156-159. Clerks superseded by laymen, 159-160. Development of steward's department, 160-162. Unity of civil service, 162-163. Treasurership of Calais, 163-164. Finance, 1361-1369, 164-165. Finance, 1369-1377, 165-168. Foreign receipt, 168-172. Expenses, 172-174. Amalgamation of king's and queen's wardrobe, 174-175. Real reason for wardrobe's diminished activity, 175-176. Itineraries of *hospicium* and *priuate familia*, 176-177. Additional difficulty in determining royal itinerary, 177-178. Movements of king and household before and after 1360, 178-181. Household officers "out of court," 181. Multiplication of small wardrobes, 181-182. Edward's declining health and Philippa's death, 182-183. Audit of wardrobe accounts, 1370-1377, 183-184. Relations between king and wardrobe in last months of king's life, 184-185.

CHAPTER XII

THE WARDROBE OF THE HOUSEHOLD UNDER RICHARD II., 1377-1399 187-225

Monotony and continuity of the Ricardian wardrobe, 187. Position of the stewards and chamberlains, 187-188. Mediocrity of wardrobe officers, 188-189. Richard's household as prince, 189-191. Household of the princess of Wales, 191-192. New element introduced into royal wardrobe, 192-193. Pakington represents element taken from household of the Black Prince, 194-195. Reginald Hilton, 195-196. Controller Baldwin Raddington, 196-198. His importance in the military development of the household, 198-199. John Stanley, 199-200. The cofferers: John Stacy and Thomas More, 200-202. Stability and insignificance of wardrobe officers, 202-203. The stewards of the household, 203-205. Wardrobe finance, 205-207. The period of 1377-1389, 207-208. The period 1390-1399, 208-209. No evidence of excessive extravagance, 209-210. Nature of "foreign" receipt, 210-211. Comparative volume of exchequer and wardrobe transactions, 212-213. Standard annual revenue of Richard II., 213-214. Household a source of political corruption, 214. Illustration of process of regularisation in exchequer and wardrobe, 214-215. Change in periods of wardrobe accountancy, 215-216. Regularity in tendering Richard II.'s wardrobe accounts, 216-218. Surviving enrolments and particulars, 218-219. The *hospicium* in 1383-1384, 219-220. In 1389-1390, 220-221. In 1392-1394, 221-222. In 1395-1396, 222-223. Laicisation of household, 223. The wardrobe as the account-

ing office of the household, 223-224. Localisation of wardrobe, 224-225. The wardrobe of the household in the fifteenth century, 225.

CHAPTER XIII

THE LATER HISTORY OF THE CHAMBER, 1327-1399 . 227-348

SECTION I. INTRODUCTORY 227-229

Three stages of chamber history between 1327 and 1399, 227. Their limits defined by the changes made in the method of supplying the chamber with funds, 227-228. First period, 1327-1333, 228. Second period, 1355-1356, 228-229. Third period, 1356-1399, 229.

SECTION II. REACTION, 1327-1333 230-237

Abolition of chamber estate, 1327, 230-231. Wholesale grant of chamber manors to queen Isabella, 231-232. Exchequer audit of arrears of chamber accounts, 1327-1330, 232-235. Scanty information concerning chamber operations and staff, 1327-1330, 235-236. Limited activity of chamber between 1327 and 1333, 236-237.

SECTION III. EXPANSION, 1333-1355 238-311

Effect on chamber of fall of Isabella and Mortimer, 238. Revival of chamber estate, 238-239. Initial stages of new process, 239-240. Hostility of exchequer, 240-241. Burstwick and Isle of Wight, 241-242. Gradual reconstitution of the chamber estate, 242-243. Forfeitures, escheats and wardships put into chamber custody, 243-245. Illustration from lands of Roger Mortimer, 245-246. Ecclesiastical estates accounting to the chamber, 246-247. Possibility of control of all alien priories going to chamber, 247-248. Benefices in alien hands, 248-249. Temporalities of vacant bishoprics, 249-250. Continental fiefs, 250-251. Reconstitution of chamber organisation, 251-252. Old and new chamber officers, 252-254. Chamberlain and sub-chamberlain, 254-255. The receiver, 255. Trussell, Kilsby and Hatfield, 256-257. Receivership between 1344-1356, 258-260. Wykeham as receiver, 260. The general receiver, 260-261. Receivers in relation to secretarial aspect of chamber, 261-262. Custody of secret seal, 262-263. Analogy of French secret seal, 263-264. Privy wardrobe staff and keepers of the king's ships, as part of chamber staff, 264. Local keepers and the change in accountability, 264-265. The old and the new types of steward, controller, surveyor and auditor, 265-266. John

Molyns and Nicholas Buckland, 267. Philip Weston, 268. Henry Greystock, 268-269. Greystock as sole steward, 269-270. Justices of the chamber, 270-271. Chamber justices in Holderness, 271-272. Coroners and escheators of the chamber, 272-276. In Holderness, 272-274. In Isle of Wight, 274. One escheator for all other chamber lands, 274-275. Their relation to ordinary escheators and to the exchequer, 275-276. The inception and development of the griffin seal, 276-278. Its custody, 278-279. Chamber archives, 279. Fixed headquarters for the chamber, 279. The itinerating chamber and the chamber in the Tower of London, 280-282. Chamber archives deposited at Westminster, 281-283. Chamber audit enforcement by exchequer, 282-283. Greystock given wider powers and further exchequer aid, 284. Chief results of the chamber base at Westminster, 284-286. Chamber accountability, 286-288. Burton's accounts and his relation to the exchequer, 288-289. Evidences for some estimate of the finances of the chamber, 290. Chamber's approximate income, 290-291. The sources of chamber income, 1333-1355, 291-293. Contrast between functions of chamber of Edward III. and that of the Despencers, 293-294. Importance of chamber in military and naval preparations; illustrations from Burton's accounts, 294-296. Contemporary indifference to the extension of chamber operations, 296. Privileges of tenants of chamber manors, 296-297. Persistent hostility of exchequer to chamber, 297-299. Need for co-operation between chamber and exchequer, 299-300. Appointment of Henry Greystock to sole charge of chamber, 300-301. Increasing dependence of the chamber on exchequer grants, 301-302. Duties transferred to wardrobe, 302-303. Preliminaries to changes of 1355-1356, 303. Reasons for changes, 304. Was Edington responsible for them? 304-305. Abolition of chamber estate, 305-306. Consequent winding up of chamber accounts: Greystock's appointment as baron of exchequer, 306-307. Audit of outstanding chamber accounts, 307-308. Documents submitted by Greystock to exchequer, 308-309. Slow transfer of lands, 309-310. Analogy of Clare household, 310-311.

SECTION IV. STABILISATION, 1356-1399 . . . 312-348

Apportionment of lapsed duties among other offices, 312-313. Nature of chamber activities, 1355-1399, 313. Provision of *certum* for chamber, 1354-1355, 313-314. Method and regularity of payment, 1354-1377, 314-315. Warranty and acknowledgment for it, 315-316. Casual income, 316-318. Suspension of *certum* during Richard II.'s minority, 318. Continued importance of financial aspect of chamber, 318-319. Restoration of *certum*, 319. The *certum* in 1380-1382

CONTENTS

xi

PAGES

and 1382-1386, 319-320. Confusion surrounding *certum* in 1386-1392, 320-323. Steadiness of *certum* in 1392-1399, 323. Increase in casual revenue from exchequer, 323-324. Other resources of the chamber, 1377-1399, 324-325. Relation of chamber to financial administration after 1355-1356, 325-326. Chamber loans to exchequer, 1355-1399, 327-329. Chamber and ransoms, 329-330. The receivers between 1355 and 1399, 330-331. Lambert and Whitehorse, 331-332. Helming Leget, William Gambon and Philip la Vache, 332-333. Receivers of Richard's early years, 333-334. Position of John Bacon, 334-335. Beauchamp, Golafre and Fermer, 335-336. Guy Mone and John Lowick, 336. Receivers as keepers of king's jewels, 336-337. Chamberlaincy after 1355; claim of Veres, 337-338. Growth of the under-chamberlaincy in consequence, 338-339. The chamberlains and sub-chamberlains after 1377, 339-341. Knights of the chamber and their importance under Richard II., 341-342. The chamber and Richard's autocratic designs, 342-343.

APPENDICES TO CHAPTER XIII

I

TENTATIVE LIST OF KNIGHTS OF THE CHAMBER IN
THE REIGN OF RICHARD II. 344-346

II

LIST OF ADVANCES FROM THE CHAMBER TO THE
EXCHEQUER, NOVEMBER, 1367-EASTER, 1368 . 347-348

CHAPTER XIV

THE GREAT WARDROBE 349-437

First appearance of the term *magna garderoba*, 349. Origin of the term, 349-350. Distinction between perishable and storable goods, 350-351. Commodities which gradually came within the province of the great wardrobe, 351-353. Subsequent removal of arms and armour from the great to the privy wardrobe, 353. Great wardrobe a storehouse for both wardrobe and chamber, 353-354. Its starting-point, 354-355. A further step taken by Henry III., 355-356. Roger de Ros, king's tailor, Hardel and Duplessis, 356-357. Association of clerks with Roger, 357-358. Evolution of a "wardrobe within the wardrobe," into the "great wardrobe," 358-359. Six ways in which subordinate wardrobe of stores achieved independence, 359-364. I, Separate section in wardrobe

accounts, 359-360. 2, Special storehouses provided for its commodities, 360. 3, An itinerating "great wardrobe," and a stationary office, 360-362. 4, Limited responsibility of keeper of wardrobe, 362-363. 5, The wardrobe of stores to account separately to the exchequer, 363-364. 6, Increasing magnitude of "great wardrobe" transactions, 364. The two keepers or buyers, 364-366. Developments during Barons' wars, 366-368. Persistence of dual buyership, 368-370. The household ordinance of 1279 and its bearing on the great wardrobe, 370-371. Effect of these regulations, 371-372. First clerks of the great wardrobe, 372-373. Appointment of the clerk by patent; John Huthwaite, 373. Influence of this on nature of the office, 373-374. Complicated enrolment of appointments, 374-375. Edward I.'s clerks or keepers, 375-376. Effect of ordinances of 1318, 376-378. Modifications introduced by ordinance of 1324, 378-379. Direct accountability to exchequer, 379-380. Distinguished keepers of Edward III., 380-382. Less prominent keepers, 382-386. The subordinate craftsmen, 386-388. The king's tailors, 388-389. The armourers, 389-390. Pavilioners, embroiderers, painters, 390-392. Purveyors, 392-393. Conflicting tendencies towards following the court and settlement, 393-397. Under Henry III. and Edward I., 393-394. Under Edward III., 394-397. London warehouse, 397-399. Three factors contributing towards localisation of great wardrobe in London, 399-401. Bardi house in Lombard Street acquired, 401-402. Complications caused by William de la Pole's interest in that house, 402-404. Grant of Lombard Street house to St. Stephen's College, 404. Acquisition of permanent quarters near Baynard's Castle, 405-406. Great wardrobe now "out of court," 406-408. Confusion between wardrobe of household and the great wardrobe, 408-409. Other uses of great wardrobe house, 409-410. Its final home, 410-411. Other localised wardrobes in the city, 411-412. Five chief functions of great wardrobe, 412-413. Distribution of great wardrobe goods, 413-416. Great wardrobe accounting, 416-417. Great wardrobe finance under Henry III., 417-418. Under Edward I., 419-420. In fourteenth century, 420. Comparison between total receipts in different periods, 420-421. Uniformity of figures in Edward I.'s accounts, 421-422. Conditions under Edward II., 422. Fluctuations under Edward III., 422-423. Receipts and expenses under Richard II., 423-424. Provenance of great wardrobe revenue, 424-426. Wardrobe intermediary between exchequer and great wardrobe till 1324, 426. From 1324 exchequer sole legal source of supply, 426-428. Methods of great wardrobe accounting, 428-437. First stage, 428. Second stage, 428-430. Third stage, 430-431. Reaction between 1351-1360, 431-432. Evi-

CONTENTS

xiii

PAGES

dence of the issue rolls, 432-433. Other sources confirm issue rolls, 433. Further evidence of the "particulars" of wardrobe accounts, 433-435. John Newbury and his will, 435-436. Audit of Newbury's account, 436. Restoration of accountability to exchequer, 436-437.

CHAPTER XV

THE PRIVY WARDROBE 439-484

The origins of the privy wardrobe, 439-440. Its dependence on the great wardrobe, 440-441. Stages in the history of the privy wardrobe, 441-442. The wardrobe of robes and arms, and the little wardrobe, 442-444. Beginnings of the privy wardrobe in the Tower, 444-445. Interest of second phase centres round John Fleet, 445-446. Fleet's combination of privy wardrobe and chamber duties, 446-447. Fleet's other titles and duties, 447-449. Privy wardrobe functions divided between the Tower and the country at large, 449-450. War a contributory factor in centralisation, 450-451. Mildenhall succeeds Fleet, 451. Difference between Fleet and Mildenhall, 451-453. Connection of Mildenhall and his successor, Rothwell, with the chamber, 453-455. Rothwell at the Tower, 455-457. Keepers Snaith and Sleaford, 457-459. John Hatfield, and the raid on the privy wardrobe in the Tower in 1381, 459-461. John Hermesthorpe, 461-462. Hatton and Lowick, 462. Surviving privy wardrobe accounts, 462. Privy wardrobe finances under Edward III., 463-464. The finances under Richard II., 464-466. Source of privy wardrobe receipts, 466-467. Operations of privy wardrobe, 467-469. Principally a warehouse, 469-470. Early use of guns and gunpowder, 470-471. Privy wardrobe concerned with firearms on a large scale, 471-472. Its small store in first years of Richard II., later amply replenished, 472-473. Development of guns, 473-474. Construction of arms and ammunition in England, 474-475. Privy wardrobe as an armoury, factory and a repair shop, 475-477. Methods by which stores accumulated, 477-478. Situation of privy wardrobe premises, 479. History of privy wardrobe after 1399, 479-480. The "master" keepers in the fifteenth century, 480-482. The "removing" privy wardrobe, 482-483. The local privy wardrobes, 483-484.

LIST OF LONGER NOTES IN VOLUME IV

	PAGES
The duplicate great seals of Richard II.	4, n. 1
Haxey's case	18-19, n. 2
The figures of Norwell's war account for the wardrobe, 1338-1340	105, n. 1
Date and authorship of letter to chancellor Thoresby, con- cerning wardships reserved to the wardrobe	123, n. 1
Period of array and audit of Farley's wardrobe account, 1359-1360	147, n. 1
Some reasons for delay in presentation of wardrobe accounts in Richard II.'s reign	217, n. 1
Illustration of relation between issue rolls and receipt rolls	321, n. 1
The two John Macclesfields	386, n. 1
Lay judges knighted, with robes of banneret, on appoint- ment to office.	413-414, n. 3
List of privy wardrobe keepers in the fifteenth century	480, n. 6

LIST OF DOCUMENTS PRINTED IN VOLUME IV

	PAGES
De contrarotulis garderobe de tempore Rogeri de Waltham admissis, from <i>M.R.K.R.</i> 105/153	92, n. 1
Mandate to exchequer limiting its revision of Norwell's wardrobe account, from <i>M.R.K.R.</i> 117	103-104, n. 3
Letter, probably by W. Dalton to chancellor Thoresby, advising a commission to inquire into wardships suit- able for wardrobe management, from <i>A.C.</i> xl. 100	123, n. 1
Exchequer memorandum concerning presentation of Buck- ingham's wardrobe account, 1353-1354, from <i>M.R.K.R.</i> 131	133, n. 2
Preamble to Ferriby's wardrobe account, 1360-1361, from <i>Exch. Accts.</i> (W. and H.), 4/5d.	150, n. 4
Writs directing exchequer to audit outstanding chamber accounts of Edward II., 1330, from <i>M.R.K.R.</i> 106/70d	234, n. 1
Writ authorising allowance to John Wodehouse, 1333, from <i>M.R.K.R.</i> 110	236, n. 5
Writ relating to issues of Burstwick reserved to the chamber, 1334, from <i>Exch. of Receipt, Warrants for Issue</i> , 3/17	241, n. 1
Justices at Hedon paid by escheator and receiver of Holderness, 1352, from <i>E.A.</i> 392/7	271, n. 6
Privy seal writ to chancellor giving evidence of Burton's two-fold account to chamber and wardrobe, from <i>C.W.</i> 1338/80	289-290, n. 3
Privy seal writ rebuking exchequer for interfering with alien priors reserved to chamber, from <i>M.R.K.R.</i> 116	298, n. 1
Writ to exchequer abolishing chamber lands, from <i>M.R.K.R.</i> 132	305, n. 2

CONTENTS

XV

PAGES

Memorandum of the surrender by Greystock of the chamber records to the exchequer, from <i>M.R.K.R.</i> 132 . . .	306, n. 1
Receipt under signet for instalment of chamber <i>certum</i> , from <i>Exch. of Receipt, Warrants for Issue</i> , 5/34 . . .	316, n. 3
List of Advances from chamber to exchequer, 1367-1368, from <i>E.A.</i> 396/8, mm. 1-2	347-348
Order for new gown to be presented to queen Philippa, from <i>E.A.</i> 393/2	415, n. 1
A debt of Henry III. to merchants still unpaid after ten years. <i>C.R.</i> 85, slip sewn on to m. 11	417, n. 2
A wardrobe debenture of E. I., from <i>Ward. Deb.</i> bundle 2	429, n. 4
Record of presentation of Newbury's great wardrobe account by his executors, with a transcript of his testament, from <i>M.R.K.R.</i> 138	435-436, n. 3
Preamble to Hatfield's privy wardrobe account, 1378-1381, from <i>E.A.</i> 400/10, and <i>L.T.R. Enr. Acc.</i> F. q. R. II, 20/9	459-460, n. 7
List of articles stolen from the Tower by the rebels of 1381, from <i>E.A.</i> 400/10	461, n. 1

Administrative History of Mediaeval England, Vol. IV.

ERRATA IN VOLS. I. AND II.

CORRECTED IN VOLS. III. AND IV.

- i. 90, n. 1 Henry I.'s grant of the master chamberlainship to Aubrey de Vere. See iii. 407, n. 2, and iv. 338, n. 2.
- ii. 165-187 Wardrobe of Edward of Carnarvon as prince of Wales. See iii. 195, n. 2.
- ii. 218 Household of chancery. See iii. 210, n. 3.
- ii. 279 Roger Waltham. For his identification with the Roger Waltham, author of *Compendium Morale*, see iv. 91.
- ii. 341 and Auditors of foreign accounts. See iii. 19, n. 1, and iv. 265, n. 2. corrigendum slip.

CHAPTER X (*Continued*)—

SECTION IV

THE RISE AND FALL OF AUTOCRACY, 1395-1399

The difficulty, of which we have always been conscious, in distinguishing precise limits to the stages of development in the reign of Richard II., becomes more acute as we approach its last and most eventful phase. We have assumed that the return of Richard from Ireland in May 1395 marked the beginning of this period, but for the next two years his policy unfolded itself so gradually that it is not easy to say exactly when he first began to be in fact a despot. The conditions precedent were peace at home and peace abroad. Already he had made vigorous efforts to establish friendly relations with France, and his next steps were to complete that understanding by a definitive peace or a long truce, and to cement the agreement by marriage into the French royal house. At the same time Richard busied himself with building up round the throne a new party, securing it a monopoly of power by the elimination of the appellants still in the administration, and strengthening its hands by the deliberate reversal of the acts of 1388, which up to now he had carefully observed. The first of these objects was achieved within a year: the second demanded more than twice as long for perfect fruition.

There had been talk of the king's remarriage soon after queen Anne's death, and from the first it was evident that Richard was minded to seek a wife in France. While he was still in Ireland, two envoys of "our kinsman of France" received safe-conducts from Calais to London and from London to Ireland.¹ On July 8, 1395, a commission, including Robert

¹ *Foedera*, vii. 794-795.

Waldby, archbishop of Dublin, John Gilbert, bishop of St. David's, the earls of Rutland and Nottingham, John, lord Beaumont, and William Scrope, "our chamberlain," was appointed to contract espousals between Richard and Isabella, the seven years' old daughter of Charles VI.¹ It was given elaborate financial instructions, embracing directions as to the extent to which the original demands might, if necessary, be abated.² A final mandate, however, was delivered in January 1396 to a smaller body from which the two bishops and Beaumont were excluded.³ In this financial demands were further reduced in the double event of the conclusion of a truce for twenty-eight years and of the promise of the French king and his uncles to support Richard against all manner of folk, "and also to aid and sustain him with all their power against any of his own subjects."⁴ After this the negotiations, which were conducted at Paris, proceeded rapidly and the marriage treaty and the extension of the truce were sealed on March 9.⁵ Although in these instruments nothing was said about Richard's suggestions for French help against his domestic enemies, it may well be believed that there was a private understanding concerning them. From that time the French became Richard's partisans, but the English looked upon the whole proceedings with coolness or distaste. They foresaw a long period of uncertainty as to the succession because of the king's marriage with a child, and they hated the effusive friendship professed between the two courts.

On March 12, 1396, the marriage was celebrated at Paris, Nottingham acting as the king's proxy. There was still much to be arranged, and, until everything had been settled, the French showed no disposition to entrust the little queen to her husband's

¹ *Foedera*, vii. pp. 802-803.

² *Ib.* pp. 804-805.

³ *Ib.* pp. 811-813. There are two sets of instructions to Rutland, Nottingham and William Scrope, dated Jan. 1, Langley, and Jan. 26, Coventry. To both, the king appended his great and privy seals and his signet.

⁴ "Et auxi de lui aider et susteigner ouec tout lour pouair encontre aucune de ses subgiz"; *ib.* p. 811. Sir James Ramsay, *Genesis of Lancaster*, ii. 305, remarks: "the words in Rymer are given in italics, as if they had been cancelled." Reference to the original, *T. R. Diplom. Doc.* 319, shows that the sentence is not cancelled, so that the italics in *Foedera* were probably devised by the editor to emphasise this extraordinary clause. But the preceding sentence suggests the same thing in more ambiguous language. Sir James was clearly right in saying that the king "gave himself away" in allowing the last sentence to be penned.

⁵ *Foedera*, vii. 813-820.

care. Accordingly, in June Richard again sent William Scrope to France to press for the transference of Isabella, suggesting that she should be sent to Calais by the beginning of August. In his impatience to receive his bride, he himself went over to Calais.¹ On August 6 he made provision for the government during his absence. The duke of York was to be regent,² and Gloucester, Lancaster and the chancellor were to accompany the king. The great seal was handed over to the custody of John Scarle, keeper of the rolls of chancery, who kept it at his lodging in Dover, where he remained, attended by the chief chancery clerks, using the seal sparingly, until the king's return.³ The chancellor took another great seal with him to Calais, where writs were sealed, some warranted *per ipsum regem*, on dates between August 10 and 22.⁴ However, Richard found that the French were still not ready to let Isabella out of their hands. He therefore re-crossed the straits and resumed the government.

There was another month of delay, so that it was not until the end of September that Richard found it desirable to appear again at Calais. On September 27 he took ship at Dover, leaving York as keeper and putting the great seal into the hands of John Scarle, who took it with him to the house of Converts in London, where he stayed until November 23. Richard remained at Calais

¹ *E.A.* 403/10 gives the movements of the "hospicium" and approximately those of the king. He left Eltham on July 30, attended Archbishop Courtenay's funeral at Canterbury on Aug. 3, and reached Calais on Aug. 7, remaining there till Aug. 22. Consequently Evesham's (p. 128) "septimo die Augusti" is absolutely right. But this author erroneously states that Richard remained in Calais until November, combining this and the subsequent visit into a single prolonged sojourn beyond the Channel.

² *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 21. This writ says that the motive for the king's visit to Calais was a personal inspection of the castle and town of Calais and other castles and fortresses in Picardy.

³ *C.R.* 238/28d, not printed in *Foedera*; *C.C.R.*, 1396-99, p. 57. The chancery was at Dover for the whole of this period.

⁴ The presence of the chancellor at Calais is proved by *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 22, where a writ of Aug. 12, issued at Calais, and warranted by privy seal, is annotated "This was executed by command of the chancellor after his return from Calais." Calais writs are also to be found in the French roll of 20 Ric. II., dated between Aug. 18 and 22; *Treaty Roll*, 81/9-10. I assume that the warranty of six out of seven "*per ipsum regem*" points to a great seal being at Calais in August, an assumption the more justifiable since we have proof that on the king's second visit to Calais he had a great seal there. Writs "*teste custode*" were issued in England between Aug. 12 and 24. I feel confident that these were sealed with the ordinary great seal used since Richard's accession. On both these points see below, p. 4, n. 1.

nearly two months, having with him the chancellor and a second great seal.¹ His time was taken up with the tedious concluding stage of the negotiations and the subsequent marriage ceremonies. Again, as in August, there was a sort of dual government, following the precedent set when Richard went to Ireland. During the whole of this time Arundel was chancellor, and sealed documents at Calais, though another great seal and most of the chancery staff were with Scarle at Westminster.² The result was

¹ This is proved by the sealing of the letters patent of Nov. 4, 1396, acknowledging the receipt of an instalment of 300,000 francs of Isabella's marriage portion, the enrolment of which on the French roll (*Treaty Roll*, 81/10) is printed in *Foedera*, vii. 846-847. The original letters patent survive in Archives Nationales J. 643, No. 12, and the seal attached to them has been described and facsimiled in Wyon's *Great Seals of England*, pp. 41-42, and plate xi. Nos. 69, 70. This seal is not the ordinary great seal of Richard II., but, as Mr. Wyon shows, is identical, save for the necessary change of name, with Edward III.'s "fourth seal," used between 1341-60 and 1370-72. The letters patent, issued at Calais on Nov. 4, 1396, provide the only surviving dated impression of it. Mr. Wyon calls it Richard's "seal for French affairs," and for us its special value is that it, in conjunction with the evidence of the French roll for 20 Richard II., proves what Sir Henry Lyte suspected, namely, the concurrent use of two great seals by Richard in 1396. It also makes it practically certain that Scarle's seal was the ordinary great seal which Richard used for the whole of his reign, of which numerous examples are extant. This ordinary great seal was only slightly different from the "seal for French affairs," being identical, except for the royal name, with the seal Edward III. used between 1372 and 1377. Thirteen other writs, issued at Calais between Oct. 3 and Nov. 12, were enrolled on the French roll (*Treaty Roll*, 81/9-10), and more, ranging from Oct. 4 to Nov. 7, were enrolled on the patent roll (*C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 42, 45, and *passim*). These last include the notifications as to the king's marriage, printed in *Foedera*, vii. 846-848. The extreme limits of the writs "teste custode," enrolled on the patent roll, are Sept. 30 to Nov. 15, 1396. These duplicate great seals of 1396 were doubtless the precedents for the two great seals which the three Lancastrian kings are known to have possessed from the early years of Henry IV., namely, a gold one which accompanied them on their travels, and a silver one used for ordinary chancery writs; Maxwell Lyte, *Great Seal*, pp. 313-316.

² Scarle's powers as keeper of the seal were limited. It was a concession in honour of St. Alban that he was allowed to give the royal assent to the election of a new abbot of St. Albans. His authority was a chancery writ from Calais addressed to the keeper of the great seal. It is wrong, therefore, to imagine that Arundel resigned the chancery when a seal was given to Scarle on Sept. 27. Arundel was described as chancellor on Oct. 3, when Nottingham, who, as captain of Calais, was bound to remain there with the king, nominated Sir William Bagot and Thomas Haxey as his general attorneys in England for a year. The writ was issued at Calais, "teste rege", and it is noted on the enrolment that "the chancellor received the attornment in person"; *Foedera*, vii. 844. Moreover, Arundel was again called chancellor when on Nov. 15, on his return, he delivered the great seal to the king at Dover castle, whereupon the king gave it to bishop Stafford, who at once took the oath as chancellor; *C.R.* 238/16d; summarised in *C.C.R.*, 1396-99, p. 73. This writ is not printed in *Foedera*. Stafford's assumption of the chancery was completed when on Nov. 23 Scarle

that there was one set of writs issued from Westminster *teste custode*, while another set was dated at Calais, *teste rege*.

At last the negotiations were complete, and a great concourse of magnates of France and of England gathered in and about Calais to celebrate the end of the long war. The elaborate festivities gave Richard ample opportunities for the pageantry, rich attire and magnificent entertainments which he loved. The French king and all his kin took up their quarters in the neighbourhood, and on October 26 Richard held his first meeting with Charles between Guînes and Ardres. On October 30 Isabella was handed over to her husband's care, and on November 4 archbishop Arundel gave the nuptial benediction at St. Nicholas' Church at Calais. It was more than a fortnight before the king was back at Westminster with his bride, and able to resume the government in person. He had now a clearer vision of his purpose and of how he might attain it. The French marriage had consummated the French alliance, and he felt that he could count upon his father-in-law's support if he got into difficulties with his subjects. If the Irish expedition was the first stage in the development of Richard's despotic plans, the second was his alliance with France.

Before this point was reached, Richard had already made progress in consolidating a new royalist party and handing over to it the administration of his kingdom. He had found it hopeless to make much impression on the greater houses. Though he had broken up the coalition on which the appellants had based their power, he was still faced with the passive opposition of the greater part of the aristocracy. Doubtless it was fear of the nobles that made Richard so slow in restoring to favour the appellants' victims. When in September 1395 the king ventured to direct the removal of Robert Vere's remains to the burial-place of his ancestors at Earl's Colne, the magnificent ceremonies of the funeral were graced by the presence of few of the greater nobility.¹ Despairing of winning them over, Richard sought to counterbalance them by creating a new aristocracy, and by

by order of the king delivered to him at Westminster the seal in his custody, Sept. 27; *Foedera*, vii. 841.

¹ *Ann. Ric.* p. 185: "Sed pauci interfuerunt proceres; quia nondum digestum fuerat odium quod conceperant contra illum."

ensuring the service of faithful ministers and instruments to execute his pleasure.

The nucleus of the aristocratic royalist party was formed by the junior members of the royal house. Here Richard had to contend with the tradition which required the king's kinsmen to be the leaders of opposition, but he was so far successful that only Gloucester remained a stalwart opponent of his policy. The duke of York, easy-going and pleasure-loving, was always at the king's disposal, and York's son Edward, earl of Rutland, more energetic than his father and as unscrupulous as a Holland, joined the widening circle of the king's loyal kinsmen. Even Gloucester had meekly attended Richard to Ireland at the head of a great retinue, and had obediently crossed over to England to beg for supplies from the parliament of January 1395. Though kept out of the negotiations with France, he appeared with the other magnates at Calais on the occasion of the royal marriage, and whatever he may have felt, he seems to have kept his discontent to himself. Lancaster, already well affected to his nephew, was, after his return from Gascony, entirely at his service. Early in 1396, duke John had married his mistress, Catherine Swynford, and Richard had presumably won over his uncle by his judicious recognition of the new duchess and by his liberal assistance to the young Beauforts in their careers in church and state. Henry of Derby, the legitimate heir of Lancaster, was now back from his foreign travels and entirely obedient to his father. Thus the whole Lancastrian clan was closely allied with the king. Nottingham, the other great convert from the appellants, had been Richard's willing fellow-worker in Ireland, in the marriage negotiations, and in the final festivities at Calais. The Hollands formed another element in the king's party. Of these John Holland, still chamberlain of England, had outgrown the violence of his earlier life and was still a link between his father-in-law Lancaster and his half-brother. His brother Thomas, earl of Kent, died in 1397, but Kent's son Thomas, third earl of Kent of his family, though through his mother the nephew of Arundel, was beginning to take his place among the king's family adherents. Taking together the Lancasters, the Hollands, and the duke of York, the king's kinsmen were more united in his support than ever before. In association with a few converts from the old families and an

increasing number of king's friends among the bishops, the new royalist aristocracy became a real force on Richard's side.

Besides his loyal kinsfolk, Richard could rely upon the unstinted devotion of his ministers. The death of Waltham on September 17, 1395, was a serious blow to him, but he found an equally zealous successor in Roger Walden.¹ As treasurer of Calais between 1387 and 1392, and subsequently as king's secretary, Walden had shown an unquestioning zeal on the king's behalf that had won his master's goodwill. He had already had some reward in the unusual amplitude of his pluralities. The new treasurer was no mere creature of court favour. He had qualities which made him well liked by both friends and enemies. The malice of St. Albans spoke of the mean birth of this butcher's son of Saffron Walden, and described him as illiterate, or as a "literate layman," but there is good evidence that he was neither puffed up by prosperity nor depressed by subsequent misfortunes, and that he was modest, pious, courteous, profitable and fastidious in speech, though better versed in affairs of the camp and the world than in those of the church and the study.² From the king's first Irish visit to his deposition, Walden was his inseparable adviser. He was succeeded as king's secretary by that John Lincoln who was already acting as his subordinate as early as Richard's visit to Ireland.³ Perhaps one of Walden's claims to remembrance is the organisation of the signet office, which permanently established the secretary and his staff as the personal secretariat of the crown, a position occupied earlier by the office of the privy seal.⁴

Not less zealous than Walden, and of much higher standing, was Edmund Stafford, keeper of the privy seal since 1389.

¹ Walden was appointed treasurer on Sept. 20, 1395, on which day Waltham's executors were ordered to hand over to him the rolls and records of the office; *C.P.R.*, 1391-96, p. 620.

² Usk, p. 38, gives the best characterisation of Walden; *Cont. Eul. Hist.* iii. 377 calls him "laicus litteratus," and the unfriendly *Ann. Ric.* p. 213, "vir penitus insufficiens et illiteratus." But archbishop Arundel's good opinion of his supplanter outweighs such disparagement. The facts about him are conveniently collected by Prof. Tait in *D.N.B.*, and in Wylie's *Henry IV.* iii. 127. An unpublished general history in *MS. Cotton, Julius*, B XIII. i. has been attributed to him, but the manuscript is clearly older than his time, and the ascription of it to "Roger Walden" in a late hand is of no evidential value.

³ See above, iii. 491.

⁴ See for this later, ch. xvii. § IV.—The Signet and the Secretary.

Stafford was, early in 1395, made Brantingham's successor as bishop of Exeter,¹ but he retained the privy seal until February 16, 1396, when Guy Mone was appointed. Mone,² a Kentish man, of long service as a king's clerk, had been receiver of the king's chamber since 1391,³ and his gradual rise into prominence showed, perhaps, that the chamber was beginning to take a more intimate share in the furtherance of Richard's schemes. He takes us back to the days of Kilsby and Hatfield, and it is significant that he retained his receivership of the chamber along with the privy seal until 1398, and only abandoned these offices on his preferment to the treasurership and the bishopric of St. Davids. His promotion was probably due to his being a full-blooded partisan of prerogative, so that Richard gained rather than lost by putting him into Stafford's place.

Thomas Arundel was the only minister who had never dissociated himself from the policy of the appellants. Why Arundel was suffered to remain chancellor for so long is inexplicable, especially as his frequent absences required the transference of the custody of the seal to John Scarle and other clerks of chancery. Arundel apparently retained Richard's complete confidence. A crowning proof of this was afforded by the events following on the death of archbishop Courtenay on July 31, 1396, on the eve of Richard's first visit to Calais. From that moment it looks as if Arundel was regarded as Courtenay's successor. Within three days of the archbishop's death, Richard passed through Canterbury on his way to Dover, accompanied by Arundel. There he issued, on August 3, a writ authorising the monks of Christ Church to elect a new archbishop.⁴ They seem at once to have "postulated" Arundel,⁵ and, on September 25, Boniface IX. issued the bull for his translation. It was, therefore, as primate-designate

¹ Stafford was elected by the chapter, having been "provided" earlier by the pope. On June 11 he received the royal licence to accept the see of Exeter, "in consideration of his services as keeper of the privy seal with the special authority of parliament and the consent of the lords of the council"; *C.P.R.*, 1391-96, p. 580. For his early career, see above, iii. 462-463.

² This is the usual spelling of the records, though "Mohun" or "Moon" are occasional alternatives. He had nothing to do with Mona, and as little, I suspect, with the house of Mohun.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 317, shows he acted from 13 June, 1391, to 1 Feb. 1398

⁴ *Ib.* p. 18.

⁵ *Ann. Ric.* p. 194: "cui successit postulatione capituli dominus Thomas Arundele."

that Arundel attended Richard on both his visits to Calais, and accompanied him to the funeral of Courtenay at Canterbury. He officiated at the new queen's wedding at Calais, attended on her first appearance in London on November 23, and crowned her at Westminster on January 7, 1397.¹ At each stage the king went out of his way to honour Arundel. Nor must his removal from the chancery be thought a mark of disfavour; for precisians still considered that the primate of all England should not also be the chief minister of state. When, on the very day of queen Isabella's arrival in London, Scarle was ordered to surrender the seal, a chronicler tells us that it was at Arundel's suggestion that Richard transferred it to bishop Stafford.²

If the exchange of the chancery for the primacy were the result of a bargain, it was a deal as much in the king's interest as Arundel's. Richard gained not only by putting into the chancery so submissive a politician as Stafford. He managed to secure the vacant archbishopric of York for his faithful helper in Ireland, friar Robert Waldby, whom he had already removed from his poor Irish archbishopric to the greater emoluments of Chichester. He now gladly restored him to archiepiscopal rank,³ and, when Waldby died a few months later, honoured him, like Waltham, with burial in Westminster abbey. Other ecclesiastical vacancies were utilised to stiffen up still more the royalist element in high posts of the church. Thus, of the intimate clerks who had been with Richard in Ireland, Roger Walden was made dean of York; another former secretary, Richard Medford, was translated from Chichester to the richer see of Salisbury; the king's former physician, the Cistercian Tydeman of Winchcomb, was similarly translated from Llandaff to Worcester; Richard's confessor, the Dominican, John Burghill, was first sent to Llandaff and soon translated to Lichfield; and Thomas Merke, monk of Westminster, Oxford doctor and Richard's reputed boon companion, was provided with the see of Carlisle. Moreover, Henry Beaufort, the second son of John of Gaunt and Catherine Swynford, was, though a mere boy, made dean of Wells and soon scandalously pushed into the see of Lincoln. The result

¹ He received his temporalities on Jan. 11, 1397; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 50; *Foedera*, vii. 848.

² *Ann. Ric.* p. 194.

³ Waldby's appointment was believed at St. Albans to be "contra vota totius cleri Eboracensis"; *ib.* p. 195.

was a multitude of courtier bishops, constantly resident at court, with their followers.¹

Neither prelates nor ministers were enough. Though the nobles were reluctant to attend the court, there were many great ladies whom the king entertained with their followers at his own expense. So that, between the bishops and the ladies, his household expenses became inordinately swollen.²

In addition to these strange recruits, Richard still had by his side the faithful household staff which had learnt discipline and homogeneity in Ireland. He relied specially on his steward, Sir Thomas Percy, who was, both from his office and by reason of his long military experience, the natural director of the military development which went on unceasingly in the royal household.³ Besides the permanent household guard, the king had now filled the land with retainers, wearing his livery and his badge of the white hart, and sworn to join the household on any royal summons for their mobilisation.⁴ Nowhere were these ministers of monarchy so numerous as in Richard's own palatinate of Cheshire, and on none of his subjects could the king place such implicit reliance as on his Cheshire men.

Second only to Percy in importance was Sir Baldwin Raddington. He, all through his long career in the household, had been as much a soldier as an administrator. Almost as influential was the under-chamberlain, William Scrope, who, as a nephew of the duke of Ireland, had a special claim on the king's affection. Scrope had been given the same prominent part in negotiating the king's second marriage that his predecessor, Simon Burley, had had in concluding the earlier alliance with Bohemia. As the old knights of the chamber and household died, Richard replaced them by new men of ability, daring and

¹ *Rot. Parl.* iii. 339.

² *Ib.* See later, p. 17, n. 1.

³ For this, see above, iii. 488-489. After 1389 the process was further developed. In 1392 the chamber knight, Sir John Golafre, had been appointed to superintend all yeomen and others below that rank in the household, and to compel those in the king's retinue, wherever throughout England or elsewhere they happened to be, to carry bows and arrows with them and practise archery; *Foedera*, vii. 721; *C.P.R.*, 1391-96, p. 74. This only deals with the permanent elements of the household troops. The reserves, liable to be called to the colours, were scattered all over the country.

⁴ Some received modest grants of land as a retaining fee. See *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 149-150, grant to John Eliot, "yeoman of the livery of the crown," of 40 acres of land in Suffolk.

lack of scruple. Such were Sir John Bushy, Sir William Bagot and Sir Henry Green, three knights whose curiously parallel careers illustrated in a striking degree the social elements which the crown now sought to win over in its unending struggle with the magnates.

All three represented the lesser territorial aristocracy, the natural antagonist of barons and bishops. Each sprang from a family of position and assumed naturally a leading place in the politics of the district with which his house was identified. Bushy was a Lincolnshire man, whose family had been established at Hougham in Kesteven for more than a century.¹ Bagot belonged to the Warwickshire branch of a family long settled in Staffordshire.² Green was a Northamptonshire man, the grandson of Edward III.'s disgraced chief justice, who, notwithstanding his misfortunes, was able to secure for his two sons, Thomas and Henry, considerable landed estates. These sons were dead, but their sons, Thomas, lord of Green's Norton, near Towcester, and Henry, lord of Drayton, near Thrapstone, were now, especially Henry, to become prominent among Richard's henchmen.³

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, p. 171, connects him with Hougham. Hugh Bushy was sheriff of Lincolnshire in 1300.

² The position of Bagot's lands is suggested by such place names as Preston Bagot and Morton Bagot, respectively east and west of Henley in Arden.

³ For the chief justice, see above, iii. 259, 393. He died on Aug. 6, 1369, leaving a large landed estate which included both a northern group of manors (Drayton, Lowick, Islip) and a southern group (Green's Norton, earlier Norton Davy, and Paulersbury); *Chanc. Inq. post-mortem Edward III.* 209/48; *Cal. Inq. post-mortem*, ii. 296; *C.Ch.R.* v. 300. Most of these went to his elder son and heir, Thomas Green, then aged "25 years and more," but the remainder of the Drayton group had already been settled on Henry, apparently the younger son; *C.C.R.*, 1369-74, pp. 47, 48, 49, 53; *C.F.R.*, viii. 48, 56. Henry, though not yet a knight, was in Sept. 1369 "abiding over sea in the king's service upon the furtherance of his war there." Both he and Thomas did homage before Dec. 2 for their respective inheritances. Thomas died on Aug. 29, 1391, for on Oct. 10, 1391, the king had "lately" taken homage from and delivered his lands to his son and heir, Thomas Green. These lands are enumerated in *Chanc. Inq. post-mortem Richard II.* 11/24. This is the Thomas Green often confused with Henry, not only by modern writers, but by contemporaries, such as the author of *Ann. Ric.* pp. 209, 243, 246. In *C.C.R.*, 1392-96, p. 260, the two are called cousins. The irresistible inference is that the Henry who won Richard II.'s favour was the son of the Henry who inherited Drayton in 1369, and that he was, therefore, grandson and not son of the chief justice, and the representative of the junior branch of the Greens. I have failed to find any post-mortem inquests on either of these two Henries or evidence of the death of the elder of the two. See for one of the two, above, iii. 392-393, n. 1. Sir Henry Green is clearly not Henry Green, Leicester herald (*C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 524), who went to Ireland in 1395 while Sir Henry stayed in England.

The earlier careers of Bushy, Bagot and Green are singularly alike. They began by showing great local activity as sheriffs, escheators, justices, and commissioners of array.¹ They had been knights of their shires in a succession of parliaments, and their subsequent history shows that parliament was already a recognised means of introducing into national politics men of local position. Bushy represented Lincolnshire in every parliament from 1386 to 1398, with the single exception of the Merciless Parliament;² Bagot was knight of the shire for Warwickshire from the Merciless Parliament of 1388 down to the last parliament of Richard's reign,³ and Green sat for Northamptonshire in 1394 and in the first parliament of 1397. He may perhaps be identified with the Henry Green who was member for Rutland in 1390, and more clearly with the member for Wiltshire in September 1397.⁴

The entry of the three knights into politics took place in the period when the commons were the sharpest critics of the crown. Bagot was a retainer of Nottingham, and, therefore, pledged to the opposition cause.⁵ Bushy and Green were also so far implicated in the party of the appellants of 1388 that they had, many years subsequently, to take out pardons for their treasonable adherence to Gloucester and Arundel.⁶ But Bushy early made his peace with the crown and by 1391 had been "retained by the king to stay with him for life" at a salary of forty marks a year, soon supplemented by larger grants.⁷ As

¹ Evidence of the work of Bushy, Bagot and Green in their respective shires can easily be collected from the *Calendars of Patent and Close Rolls*. Bushy was sheriff of Lincolnshire, 1383-86, Bagot of Leicestershire and Warwickshire, 1382-84.

² He was member for Lincolnshire in the parliaments of 1386, 1388 (Cambridge), 1390 (two), 1391, 1393, 1394, 1395, and 1397 (two). His father, Sir William Bushy, had sat for the same shire in four parliaments between 1368 and 1380; *List of Members of Parliament*, pp. 180-256.

³ *Ib.* pp. 233-264.

⁴ *List of Members of Parliament*, pp. 238, 248, 253, 257. The grant to him on Sept. 27 of Wiltshire lands, forfeited by Arundel and Warwick, reads suspiciously like giving him a local qualification for election; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 198, 221.

⁵ See, for instance, *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, pp. 456, 509, and *ib.*, 1401-5, p. 96, showing that Nottingham granted him for life the manor of Crick, Northants. See for his general career, *Staffordshire Collections of W. Salt Soc.*, N.S., xi. 45-54. See also later, pp. 13-14.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 331, pardon of May 1, 1398, to Bushy and Green for adhering to the commission assuming royal authority in 10 Richard II.

⁷ *Ib.*, 1391-96, p. 2. See also pp. 219, 380.

Richard's personal policy developed, Bushy's special gifts made him a useful royal agent. Thus he was employed to direct municipal elections at Lincoln so that the "contrary opinions" of the citizens of that city might be guided to choose mayor and bailiffs "pleasing to God and good for the king,"¹ and subsequently to appease the feud between the "high and mighty persons" of Lincoln and the king's "middling subjects thereof."² Such power of managing men may well have secured his election as Speaker in the parliament of 1394, and his continuance in that position in subsequent parliaments.³ Certain it is that all these parliaments were very astutely attuned to the king's policy and that Bushy's shrewdness and dexterity had a large share in keeping them in a good temper. From that time onwards, he gradually crept into the inner circle of the king's confidants, though always as a man under orders, rather than as an initiator of policy. His gross flattery of the weak king, and his exalted theory of the prerogative, no doubt contributed to his advancement.

It was only when Richard had definitely begun his struggle for despotism that Bushy appeared in the king's council. Bagot and Green were even later in winning the royal confidence. Bagot in 1379 was still an esquire of John of Gaunt.⁴ In March 1388, he was associated with the sheriff of Warwick in receiving oaths from the men of position in the shire, to uphold the cause of the lords appellant until the end of the Merciless Parliament, and "maintain" them to the death.⁵ Even then Bagot was willing to "mainpern" so strong a royalist as John Lincoln of Grimsby.⁶ But his relations with the house of Mowbray inevitably brought him round to the court when Nottingham went over to the king's side. For instance, at the end of 1396 he, with Thomas Haxey, acted as general attorney for the earl marshal when he was compelled, as captain of Calais, to be in attendance on the king during the

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1391-96, p. 355.

² *C.C.R.*, 1392-96, p. 162.

³ Bushy is recorded as Speaker in 1394, and in both parliaments of 1397; *Rot. Parl.* iii. 310, 338, 348. The parliament roll of 1395 does not mention the Speaker's name, but I suspect that Bushy acted. Anyhow, he did not go to Ireland with the king and was, therefore, available.

⁴ *Duchy Lanc. Misc. Bks.* xiv. 21, 105.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1385-89, pp. 405-406. Compare the full terms of the oath in *Foedera*, vii. 572. The Calendar's translation of "generosi et validi" is hardly adequate.

⁶ *C.C.R.*, 1385-89, p. 414.

wedding negotiations.¹ It was easy, however, in the fourteenth century to serve two masters. By the summer of 1397 Bagot was already a king's knight, "retained for life to stay with the king,"² and we soon read of "his recent great expenses, labours and diligence in the king's service."³

Sir Henry Green, a retainer of John of Gaunt since 1391,⁴ was only on March 1, 1397, given by the king a life rent of forty marks. He was described as a king's knight, because he was "retained to stay with the king for life."⁵ This grant was cancelled in September, because he then received much more ample endowment.⁶ In August 1397 Green and Bushy are recorded as receiving £100 a year each, because "charged to attend the king's council during pleasure,"⁷ and again the endowment was revoked later because a greater grant was made from other sources. By this time these three king's knights had attained such a position that their subsequent history can be studied only in the light of the monarchical revolution in which they played such a conspicuous part. It is significant that, even at a moment of parliamentary degradation, the autocrat should have chosen as his agents members of the popular branch of parliament, and have kept them in their seats as long as its power endured. A monarchical *coup d'état*, like an aristocratic withdrawal of all power from the crown, could only be effected by and through parliament. We must accordingly turn once more to parliamentary history.

The first parliament since 1395 met on January 22, 1397, at Westminster, within three weeks of the coronation of the little queen. A parliament generally meant that the king was eager for extraordinary supplies, and it was, perhaps, a disappointment

¹ *Foedera*, vii. 844. See also above, p. 4, n. 2.

² *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 178. This grant, apparently of August, was "vacated because nothing was done therein." But a series of other grants follows; *ib.* pp. 210, 215, 350, 421, 427, 494.

³ *Ib.* p. 215.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 522, shows that on Mar. 6, 1391, John of Gaunt retained Henry Green, knight, for life, to serve him in peace and war for fifty marks a year. This was confirmed by the crown on Mar. 23, 1399, after the duke of Lancaster's death. He, or his father, was, in 1379-82, John of Gaunt's "tres ame bachelor"; *Duchy Lanc. Misc. Bks.* xiv. ff. 18, 121.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 87.

⁶ *Ib.* pp. 196, 198. See also pp. 221, 226, 322, 332, 522.

⁷ *Ib.* p. 360. "Vacated because discharged" only suggests a more ample and permanent method of payment.

to the nation that, in spite of the French alliance, there was still small possibility of the king living "of his own." Apart from the huge sums lavished on the wedding festivities at Calais and Westminster, Richard had now a special need of money, because he had promised his father-in-law, the king of France, to send the earls of Rutland and Nottingham, with troops equipped at his expense, to take part in a mad scheme, devised by the duke of Burgundy, for waging war against Gian Galeazzo Visconti in Milan. It was a new extension of the method by which John of Gaunt and bishop Despenser had been given parliamentary support for their filibustering "crusades" in Flanders, France or Castile. To fulfil this promise, the hearty support of the commons was necessary, the more so since little was to be expected from the mass of the peers, who, under the leadership of Gloucester, Warwick and the Arundel brothers, were expected to oppose the king's policy. Bushy, again Speaker, was needed to talk over the commons with the help of Bagot and Green. His efforts were fairly successful, for in a short session of three weeks the king obtained a substantial victory despite a strenuous resistance, at the cost of abandoning his proposals for new taxation. This parliament is, therefore, memorable for two reasons: firstly, because it affords evidence of the growing importance of the commons; and secondly, because it shows how the king managed, in the teeth of strong opposition, to secure their support.¹

¹ The official material for the history of this parliament, contained in *Rot. Parl.* iii. 337-346, is scanty and imperfect. The parliament roll, good up to a certain point, is remarkable for its omissions, some of which suggest either conscious avoidance of disagreeable topics or even deliberate tampering with the roll. There is a fairly complete diary of proceedings from Jan. 22 to Feb. 3, if we can venture to assume that there were no sessions between Jan. 25 and Feb. 1. It is clear that on this latter day the commons brought to the lords their famous remonstrance against the king's government, digested under four heads, the last of which so infuriated Richard that, after consulting the lords on Feb. 1, he forced the commons to submit on Feb. 2. We can supplement the roll by the pardon issued to Haxey, on May 27, which recites how, on Feb. 5, the lords declared new doctrines of treason, and, on Feb. 7, condemned Haxey to death for infringing them. This patent is printed in *Rot. Parl.* iii. 407-408, though the reference to the patent roll is wrong, the right reference being *Pat. 20 R. II. pt. iii.*, m. 12. It seems likely that the elaborate details of the proceedings of Feb. 5 and 7, copied out in the patent of pardon, came from a part of the parliament roll which is not in the printed copy, and is probably not now in existence. After this the parliament roll takes up the story again, giving us (p. 341) the remission of the death penalty of Haxey and his relegation to ecclesiastical custody, on the petition of the prelates, immediately after his condemnation. We then have copious details of the proceedings of parliament on Feb. 10, but

When the estates met, chancellor Stafford delivered a formal speech to a thin gathering of magnates. Two days later, the chancellor, with the other ministers and chief counsellors of the king,¹ appeared in a body before the commons in the refectory of the abbey and set forth the "special intention of the king," though Stafford had been content to declare to the full parliament no more than his master's "general intention." The proposed expedition to Italy was so alarming that the commons begged the king to compel the laggard peers to attend to their duty. This Richard refused to do, lest it delayed proceedings unduly. But he must have been little satisfied when, next day, the commons appeared in full parliament and discreetly avoided giving him the answer he wanted. With the servile eloquence of which speaker Bushy was a master, the commons repudiated all desire for preventing the king from redeeming his promise to his "father of France," but urged that the matter was a private affair between the two sovereigns. The commons, having no share in the responsibility for such, had no intention of making any contribution towards the cost. Richard harangued the commons on the necessity of demonstrating by common action the reality of the Anglo-French friendship.

A week later, on February 1, the commons came to the lords with a policy. They had no more to say about the Italian voyage, but they had drafted under four heads their grievances. Despite the statute, sheriffs and escheators were constantly kept in office beyond their proper term of one year. The negligent custody of the Scottish March tempted the Scots to frequent violations of the truce. The statute against the wearing of "cognisances" by retainers not of their lords' households had

after that, silence for the last eleven days. The chroniclers have so little to say about this parliament that we might almost suspect a conspiracy of silence. This silence is complete as far as the monk of Evesham and Usk are concerned. *Ann. Ric.* pp. 195-196, gives only a short account, which is faithfully copied by Walsingham, ii. 222, ignoring most of the real points of interest. In the account I have attempted, I have pieced together into a coherent narrative the fragmentary information available, but I am not quite convinced of my explanation of the action of the king and the various parties in parliament.

¹ *Rot. Parl.* iii. 338, mentions Walden the treasurer, Guy Mone, keeper of the privy seal, Richard Scrope, bishop of Lichfield, and "autres du conseil du roy." A few lines later, we learn that these others included the archbishop of Canterbury and the two earls, Rutland and Nottingham, who were specially pledged to the Lombard expedition.

been scandalously disregarded. The cost of the king's household was excessive, especially by reason of the number of bishops and ladies with their retainers, maintained there at the king's expense.¹

The fourth article was couched in uncourtier-like language, but the administrative grievances of the commons were no new thing. Richard condescended to argue with the commons about their first three points. He stated, quite reasonably, the advantages of employing experienced men in local administration, and promised to see that the Scottish March was properly defended. But the other articles, especially that about the bishops and ladies of the household, filled him with fury. It was contrary to his "regality" that his liegemen should presume to govern the royal household or to criticise persons of quality whom he was pleased to retain in his company. Having heard that the last complaint was the outcome of a "bill," handed to the commons by a "certain person," he ordered his uncle of Lancaster to inquire from the Speaker his name.

On February 3 the commons delivered the "bill" to the lords, and announced that it had been handed to them by Thomas Haxey. Thereupon they were summoned to appear before the king in full parliament. They followed up their complaisance by a complete submission to the royal will. They recognised that they had meddled in things which appertained to the king alone, and humbly begged to be excused for their presumption, thus virtually accepting Richard's theory of his prerogative. The king showed his gratitude by renouncing his demand for extraordinary supplies, and no more was heard of the "voyage" of the two earls. The commons had scored in the matter of taxation, but at the cost of their power of control of the state and household.

The lords were not behindhand in submissiveness. On February 5, they resolved that it was treason for anyone to excite the commons in parliament to reform anything touching the person, government or "regality" of the sovereign. Two days later, Haxey was condemned to the penalties of treason for having broken this pronouncement of the magnates. But he was never in great danger of a traitor's death for, two days

¹ *Ib.* p. 339. They complained "de la multitude des evesques qui ont seignuries et sont avancez par le roy et leur meignee, et aussi de plusieurs dames et leur meignee qi demurent en l'ostel du roy et sont a ses costages."

earlier, Richard had delivered him to the custody of the archbishop of Canterbury, whose claim for him as a clerk on February 7 was, therefore, formal.¹ Three months later, he received a full pardon. The king was not malevolent when he had got what he wanted, and the violence with which Haxey had been pursued was due, not so much to his offence, as to the disgust of the court at his change of front. For Haxey was neither a "proctor" of the clergy in parliament, nor in any sense a member of parliament. He was a royal official, a king's clerk who had acted for years as clerk of the common bench, and had been well beneficed in reward for his services. He was also a dependent of the earl of Nottingham, whose attorney he had recently been, during the earl's absence abroad. It was doubly treacherous for him to desert both his royal master and his patron. A sharp example was necessary to ensure fidelity among the retainers of the king and his friends. When the lesson had been taught, Haxey became insignificant and was easily forgiven.²

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1396-99, p. 39, shows that Haxey, already imprisoned in Windsor castle, was on Feb. 5 handed over to two sergeants-at-arms to be delivered to the custody of the archbishop.

² The relevant documents of Haxey's case are in *Rot. Parl.* iii. 339, 341, 407-408 and 430. It has been much discussed and often regarded as involving matters of constitutional importance. It was strongly held by Hallam (*Middle Ages*, iii. 75-76) that Haxey was a "member of parliament" who brought forward in the commons a "bill" in the modern sense of a proposal for legislation. But "bill" was not in 1397 used in any such specific sense; it was a vague word that covered almost any document. It is certain also that Haxey was not, as Hallam and Stubbs thought, a member of parliament. Haxey, in his own words, "bailla une bille as communes"; *Rot. Parl.* iii. 430. But a clerk could not possibly have been either a knight of the shire or a burgess, and his name does not occur among the commoners elected to that parliament. Stubbs suggested that he must have been a representative of the lower clergy sitting "under the *praenuntientes* clause"; *C.H.* ii. 516-517. This view has been accepted, even by Dr. R. L. Poole and Sir James Ramsay. But I agree with Professor Pollard that there is no evidence for it; *Evolution of Parliament*, p. 74. The claim is no better substantiated than Lechler's argument that Wyclif was "a member of parliament" in 1374. Indeed, there is little evidence that the lower clergy had "representatives" in the parliaments of the later fourteenth century. See, however, Miss Levett in *Econ. Hist. Rev.* i. 70. Haxey, as an official of the bench, was naturally about Westminster, having a better right to witness parliamentary doings than Adam Usk, an advocate in the court of arches, who was present every day in the second parliament of 1397; Usk, p. 9. See later, p. 25, n. 1. That outsiders could witness parliamentary proceedings and present petitions or bills is also shown by the well-known articles against the possessioner monks presented to king and council by two Austin friars in the parliament of 1371, printed by Mr. Galbraith in *E.H.R.* xxxiv. 579-582. Like the friars' articles, Haxey's "bill" was an outside effort of an intelligent observer, having, perhaps, in this case, special knowledge of household

The exciting case of Haxey threw into the background the other proceedings of the January parliament. Yet it was of

scandals. The explanation of why Richard resented Haxey's action so bitterly is to be found in his official positions, unknown to his biographers. The best of these, the late Canon Raine (*Fabric Rolls of York Minster*, Surtees Society, 1859, pp. 203-206) and Dr. R. L. Poole (in the *D.N.B.*) have dealt exhaustively with Haxey's clerical career, but it was not until the publication of the Calendars of Patent and Close Rolls for this reign, that his official record could be conveniently studied. We now know that Haxey had been a king's clerk since 1382 (*C.C.R.*, 1381-85, p. 212), that all his numerous prebends, livings and pensions were conferred upon him by the crown as reward for his service; that in his early days he had done a profitable business in money lending (*ib.* pp. 238, 589, 607; *ib.*, 1385-89, pp. 143, 247, 252, 261, 442, 444, 449, etc.); that in 1387 he was clerk of John Waltham, then keeper of the privy seal (*I.R.* 515/26); and that on June 18, 1387, he had been granted for life the important office of keeper of the writs and rolls of the common bench; *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 314. This appointment was cancelled, but we soon find him again in possession of the office, which he retained until his disgrace, being, for instance, in charge of the records of the bench during its migration to and from York in 1392 (*ib.*, 1391-96, p. 63; *C.C.R.*, 1389-92, p. 467; *ib.*, 1392-96, p. 76). He is also called chief clerk of the common bench in *C.C.R.*, 1389-92, p. 551. This office naturally compelled his attendance at Westminster, where the bench normally sat. Therefore there is no need to assume that his presence there was due either to election to parliament or to his appointment, on Oct. 3, 1396, jointly with Sir William Bagot, as general attorney for a year of the earl of Nottingham; *Foedera*, vii. 844. This deputising for a declared partisan of Richard jointly with one of the king's chief agents in engineering a royalist reaction, together with his very liberal preferments, suggests that Richard's anger against him was roused by the desertion of his cause by a faithful and well-rewarded servant of at least fifteen years' standing. Haxey was also in such constant relation with the chief chancery clerks and other officers of the crown, that the index maker of the *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 1385-89, described him as a clerk of chancery, though I have found no direct statement to that effect. It looks as if Haxey, like many of his class, discontented with the doings at court, essayed to play in this parliament the part played by such chancery clerks as Geoffrey Martin, or John Scarborough, during the Merciless Parliament of 1388. See above, iii. 431, n. 2; 432, n. 1; and 448, nn. 3-4. However, times had changed during the intervening ten years. Haxey's treachery seems to have led Richard to one of his characteristic outbursts of violent rage, and both lords and commons gratified his resentment to the full. But the king's wrath was, as usual, short lived, and was appeased by Haxey's condemnation as a traitor on Feb. 7, and by the appointment on Feb. 8 of a new clerk of the common bench; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 81. Not only did Richard hand over the culprit to clerical custody and, therefore, spare his life. In little more than a fortnight he ratified Haxey's estate in two of his benefices (*ib.* p. 88), and in April confirmed him in four of his prebends and one of his livings (*ib.* pp. 123, 141). Haxey's formal pardon was issued on May 27 (*Rot. Parl.* iii. 407), though it was not until after Henry IV.'s accession that the proceedings against him were reversed; *ib.* p. 430. Though he enjoyed his preferments till his death in 1425, his official career ended in 1397. His highest preferment was the treasurership of York Minster, where his tomb can still be seen. For his erection of a cathedral library there, between the south transept and the nave, see Rev. F. Harrison's "Dean and Chapter Library" in *York Minster Historical Tracts*, 627-1927, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (1927).

some importance that rewards and punishments were meted out to the friends and foes of the king. The alliance of Richard and the house of Lancaster was made closer when the king announced that he had, as "emperor of his realm," legitimated the children of John of Gaunt and Catherine Swynford, and conferred on the eldest of these, John Beaufort, the earldom of Somerset. Nottingham's dignity of earl marshal was recognised as hereditary. Other blows to the magnates were that parliament forbade their presence on the bench as "assessors" of the king's justices at assizes, and that Warwick was fined for contempt of a royal judgment confiscating one of his Gower manors. Lastly, the assent of lords and commons was obtained to the restoration of Bealknap and the other justices banished to Ireland in 1388. Yet Richard still moved with caution in his gradual efforts to undo the acts of the Merciless Parliament, for the act restoring the judges provided that all other points in the statute of the eleventh year should be upheld.

The withdrawal from the Milanese voyage, and the declaration that legislation of 1388 was still valid, showed that Richard had not lost all sense of moderation, though consciousness of power inspired him with visions of future magnificence which boded ill for the rights of his subjects. Disappointed at not being able to be the companion-in-arms of the French king, Richard gave ready ear to other plans for foreign aggrandisement. At one time he made serious efforts to secure election as king of the Romans, instead of his drunken brother-in-law, Wenceslaus, whom the German nobles were threatening with deposition.¹ At another, he was mixed up in a wild plan for making his brother, Huntingdon, "captain and counsellor of the Roman church" with a strange medley of ecclesiastical and civil powers,² promoted in the hope of strengthening the hold of the Roman pope over his Italian patrimony. Costly schemes were also devised at home, among them being the virtual reconstruction of Westminster hall into

¹ *Ann. Ric.* p. 199, dates the visit of the provost of Cologne as "about June 24." Richard prepared the way for his candidature by granting pensions of £1000 a year to two of the electors, the count palatine and the archbishop of Cologne, who did homage to him, and by sending Rutland, Nottingham and the bishop of Carlisle on a mission to the Rhineland; *Foedera*, vii. 854, 858; viii. 2, 3, 23.

² *Ann. Ric.* pp. 200-201, enumerates these powers.

the building which we still have.¹ The need of financial backing for these activities drove Richard to resort to all manner of expedients for raising money. "From this time," writes the St. Albans chronicler, "the king began to play the tyrant, to impoverish his people, and to borrow large sums of money so that no rich man could avoid the obligation of lending money to the king."²

The survivors of the opposition were naturally disturbed by Richard's proceedings. Up to now, they had observed outward respect to the king, and had taken their due part in the recent parliament. Soon, however, relations became severely strained. Before February was over, Gloucester and Arundel infuriated the king by refusing to attend a council to which they had been summoned.³ Richard threw himself more and more into the hands of "young and foolish counsellors," especially John Bushy, who encouraged him to indulge his wrath against his enemies.⁴ In later days Richard's French friends accused Gloucester and Arundel of forming a conspiracy to depose the king and divide his kingdom between them; but it is certain that Richard knew nothing of such plots, or he would later have made them a chief article of accusation against the two earls. It is much more likely that the king himself was the active conspirator. He had clearly resolved to throw over his last pretence of acceptance of the legislation of 1386-88, to repudiate the parliamentary commission, and to wreak vengeance on the impenitent appellants. After twelve years of repression, it was easy to keep his own counsel while he mustered his retainers and prepared his forces for a great stroke of policy. At last, in July 1397, he felt the time had come when he might safely take his revenge.

Richard dissembled his designs until the last moment. His master-move was to invite his chief enemies to a banquet on July 10, 1397,⁵ believing that, when thus gathered together, it

¹ Evesham, p. 130: "Sub hiis diebus rex fecit reparari magnam aulam Westmonasterii, tam in parietibus, fenestris quam in tecturis et coelaturis mirabilis operis." Compare *Foedera*, vii. 794.

² *Ann. Ric.* pp. 199-200.

³ Evesham, p. 129. This "concilium apud Westmonasterium in mense Februarii" cannot be the parliament, for both Gloucester and Arundel were present at that.

⁴ *Ib.* pp. 129-130.

⁵ The feast was at the house of the chancellor outside Temple Bar; *Rot. Parl.* iii. 436.

would be easy to arrest them all at once. But Gloucester pleaded ill-health and betook himself to Pleshy, and Arundel shut himself up in Reigate castle. Warwick alone appeared, and was arrested at the end of the entertainment. Richard still remained on apparently cordial terms with the archbishop of Canterbury, and induced him to urge his brother, the earl, to leave Reigate and submit himself to the king's pleasure. Thereupon Richard rode down by night to Pleshy, attended by his armed household and a great band of Londoners. On July 11, Gloucester, though seriously ill, was forced to ride to London, whence he was transported to Calais under Nottingham's custody.¹ His condemnation was foreshadowed by the transference of his office of constable of England to the earl of Rutland.²

The arrest of Gloucester, Arundel and Warwick created a sensation. There was lively denunciation of the king's policy, and Richard found it necessary to order the imprisonment of all persons who spoke against the seizure of the three lords, and to assure the public that their fate was due to their extortions.³ He further gave out that he had imprisoned the traitors on the advice of eight specified counsellors, the six earls of Rutland, Nottingham, Kent, Huntingdon, Somerset and Salisbury, and two other magnates, Thomas Despenser and William Scrope.⁴ Before long, the same eight assembled at Nottingham before the king and his council, and resolved upon a plan of further action. There was to be a new appeal of treason, and the eight were to act as appellants, laying their bill of appeal before the council. Every stage of the appeal of 1387-88 was closely imitated, and a parliament was accordingly necessary to undo the work of the earlier parliament.

The chroniclers speak of the *concilium juvenile*, to which Richard now chiefly looked for advice. Of this body the eight new appellants formed the nucleus. Though six of them were earls, only one of the earldoms dated before Richard's reign, and they, therefore, represented the new aristocracy, closely related

¹ *Ann. Ric.* pp. 201-206, give a detailed account of these arrests with picturesque details intended to show up the king's treachery.

² *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 171. This was on July 12.

³ *Foedera*, viii. 6, 7.

⁴ *Ann. Ric.* p. 207: "convocatis dominis sibi cohaerentibus apud Notyngham ac justiciariis aliisque de concilio."

to the throne, by means of which the king hoped to reduce the old nobles to insignificance. As a body, the new appellants were singularly devoid of wisdom and experience. Nottingham, the most distinguished of the eight, was not much older than the king. Four of his colleagues were nearly related to Richard. Huntingdon was the king's brother, but his career of violence and brutality had deprived him of all claim to respect, while Kent, Richard's nephew, and Rutland and Somerset, his first cousins, were all in their early twenties. Of those less closely akin to the king, Despenser, though very young, had the merit of representing an historical family. The other two, Salisbury and Scrope, were both men of experience, a little older than Huntingdon, who was forty-five. But Salisbury had only just come into his earldom and was discredited as a suspected Lollard. Scrope was the only official who took part in the appeal, and it is perhaps significant that Richard did not venture to thrust any of them, except the chamberlain, into prominence.

Writs were now issued for a parliament to meet at Westminster on September 17. The greatest care was taken to secure that its members should be readily responsive to the king's wishes. Richard could expect little help from the majority of the older aristocracy, but the magnates were alarmed at the arrest of their old leaders, were divided into conflicting factions, and were bewildered by the steady support which the house of Lancaster continued to give to the crown. The appointment of courtier bishops had reduced the opposition among the higher clergy, and the most representative of the prelates, such as Wykeham, were enfeebled by age or suspected, like Arundel. It seems pretty clear that the commons' representatives were carefully selected by subservient sheriffs from men who were not likely to take up an independent attitude.¹

The best evidence that Richard was prepared to stick at nothing comes from his elaborate mobilisation of his household forces to overawe the estates. There was no secrecy about this. Writs to the sheriffs summoned all the "yeomen of the crown,"

¹ In the nature of things, little evidence of packing can be given; but the change in the personnel of the knights of the shires, and the accusation of packing made by Nottingham and others, makes probable the statement of *Ann. Ric.* p. 209, that the knights of the shires "non fuerunt electi per communitatem, prout mos exigit, sed per regiam voluntatem."

and all persons wearing the king's livery of the white hart, to meet him at Kingston-on-Thames, two days before the assembly of parliament, and go with him to Westminster.¹ Moreover, the magnates on whom the king could rely, such as his uncles of Lancaster and York, and his cousin of Derby, received licenses to come to Westminster with a train of men-at-arms for the king's protection.² Most odious of all was the great swarm of Cheshire archers, drawn from Richard's personal estates, devoted to their lord, bold, reckless, cruel and violent, who henceforth became his bodyguard.³ While the king and his friends thus mustered in strength, proclamation was made that no one, except the king's retinue, was to wear arms in parliament.⁴ The display of troops was made the more formidable by parliament meeting in a temporary wooden structure, erected in some interior court of Westminster palace, open at the sides and accessible, therefore, to the Cheshire archers, who surrounded it, ready for action and eager to anticipate disturbance by armed intervention.⁵ If careful selection and previous threatenings could not secure a docile parliament, there was the irresistible argument of the Cheshire archers and the yeomen of the white hart to fall back upon. The clever organisers had their full reward. Everything went exactly as had been planned. The whole parliament showed itself absolutely submissive to the king's wishes. In a brief session of a fortnight it solemnly handed over to the crown its most cherished privileges, and Richard emerged a despot in fact as well as in theory.

On September 17, Stafford opened proceedings with a sermon on the blessings of monarchy, insisting upon the unity and indivisibility of the royal power, the obligation imposed on parliament of punishing those who had restrained the king's natural authority, and the necessity of providing adequate precautions against repetition of the offence in the future. As in the earlier parliament of 1397, the method adopted was to throw responsibility and initiative upon the commons. On September

¹ *Foedera*, viii. 13.

² *Ib.* viii. 14.

³ *Ann. Ric.* p. 208; Evesham, p. 133.

⁴ Evesham, p. 132.

⁵ The reason for this was probably the reconstruction of Westminster hall, and the consequent disturbance of the normal arrangements of the palace. After the parliament was over the king at once demolished this temporary "domus parliamenti." *Cont. Eul. Hist.* iii. 373, speaks of the parliament meeting in "magno tentorio quod in pavimento Westmonasterii (rex) statuerat."

18, Sir John Bushy was made Speaker. With the assistance of Sir William Bagot and Sir Henry Green, he at once dominated the knights and burgesses, and presented himself from time to time to the full parliament with proposals already elaborated. The precise chronological sequence of the proceedings is impossible to determine, as the authorities for the history of the parliament are at variance on this point, though in remarkable agreement as to their purport.¹ Every proposal came before parliament from Bushy as the suggestion of the commons, and each of them was, in its turn, accepted by acclamation. The timid prelates were compelled, after two days' hesitation, to nominate Sir Thomas Percy, steward of the household, as proctor of the clergy, so that proceedings might not afterwards be invalidated by reason of the non-approval of the clerical estate.² The act of 1386, appointing the parliamentary commission, and the consequential pardons, given in 1388 to the appellants, were at once revoked. Richard announced that he would respect the pardon of members of the commission who had proved their loyalty, whereupon the duke of York and the bishop of Winchester, weeping with joy, threw them-

¹ The official account in *Rot. Parl.* iii. is curiously split up into three sections. The first, pp. 347-356, gives a diary of the proceedings between Sept. 17 and 30 at Westminster; the second, pp. 356-373, the proceedings of the adjourned session at Shrewsbury between Jan. 28 and 31, 1398, and the third, headed "placita corone coram domino rege in parlamento suo apud Westmonasterium, die lune proxima post festum exaltacionis sancte crucis, anno . . . vicesimo primo," is mainly devoted to the treason trials at Westminster and Shrewsbury, but also contains notes of the proceedings up to Apr. 1399, of the standing committee appointed at Shrewsbury. With the roll of the latter stages of the parliament we shall deal later, but it must now be suggested that the possibility of the rolls having been tampered with cannot be excluded in judging the value of the record of the September meetings. This is the more important since the chroniclers' accounts of the Westminster proceedings arrange some of the debates in different order from that of the roll. These chronicles are all strongly anti-Ricardian in their attitude. The chief of them are (1) Evesham, pp. 131-142, a valuable account, and vouched for indirectly by being extensively used in the narrative of the parliament by (2) Adam Usk, pp. 9-18, who was personally present during the whole of the session, and by following Evesham, seems to accept him as authentic; (3) *Ann. Ric.* pp. 209-224, interesting but declamatory and very prejudiced; (4) Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.* ii. 224-227, who severely abridged *Ann. Ric.*; and (5) *Cont. Eul. Hist.* iii. 373-377, short, but containing valuable points.

² *Rot. Parl.* make this happen on Sept. 18, the second day of the parliament, but I agree with Sir James Ramsay in preferring to follow Evesham and Usk, who date it on Sept. 20. It looks as if the opposition, excited by the proposal on Sept. 18, could only be overcome by two days' delay and the exclusion of Arundel. Yet Arundel is reported to have been a participator in the act.

selves on the ground and humbly thanked their sovereign for his clemency.¹ When magnates of the highest rank showed such oriental deference, we can make allowances for the abject servility with which the Speaker approached the throne.²

Archbishop Arundel strove to steer his usual course. He took his place as a trier of petitions and attended the first two meetings. He opposed the appointment of a proctor for the clergy, and strove to limit his power, but showed timidity in resisting the king. Already on the second day, Bushy had attacked him, and when Arundel rose to defend himself, Richard had put him off by telling him to speak on the morrow. Two days later he was warned not to appear.³ On September 20 the unconditional procuration of the clergy was passed in his absence, and immediately afterwards Bushy, in the name of the commons, impeached him of treason for his share in the events of 1386-88. It was useless for Arundel to deny notorious facts, and he was, therefore, regarded as having confessed his crimes. On September 25 he was condemned to exile and forfeiture. A day was appointed for his leaving the country, and the pope was invited to "translate" him to a schismatic see and put Roger Walden, the treasurer, in his place. A new definition of treason was hastily accepted, so that all was ready for the trial of the prisoners of July. With these events the first stage of the proceedings came to an end.

The commons' initiative had now exhausted itself, but side by side with these proceedings the new appeal had already been begun. On September 21, the day after the archbishop's confession, the eight lords appellant appeared, clothed uniformly in gowns of red, bordered with white, and made their charges. Besides Gloucester, Arundel and Warwick, they now included in their appeal a less conspicuous rebel, Sir Thomas Mortimer, an illegitimate son of the second earl of March and the uncle of the then earl. On the first day Arundel alone was dealt with. The proceedings were disgraced by scenes of unseemly violence, in which Lancaster forgot his dignity as high steward and Derby

¹ Evesham, 136; Usk, pp. 12-13.

² *Ann. Ric.* p. 210: "Johannes Bussy in cunctis suis propositionibus non humanos honores exhibuit regi, sed divinos, adinveniens verba adulatoria et insueta mortalibus minime congruentia. At rex juvenis . . . haec non repressit, ut decuit; sed in hiis nimium delectabatur."

³ Usk, p. 11. As a dependent on Arundel, Usk is likely to have vividly remembered these scenes.

rudely gave the lie to the prisoner. Finally Arundel was told that his pleading a pardon, which had been revoked, availed him nothing. On the same day he was convicted, led to Tower Hill by his own kinsmen, Nottingham and Huntingdon, and beheaded without delay. Warwick was brought up next. He showed nothing of the arrogant resolution of Arundel, and his abject submission mitigated his sentence to banishment to the Isle of Man. When Gloucester's turn came, it was announced that he was already dead, but a confession of his guilt was read, procured by a justice named Rickhill, who had been sent to Calais to receive it. It is pretty clear that Gloucester, having made his confession, had been murdered to avoid the risk of exciting sympathy for a popular hero standing his trial in person.¹ It was now safe to pronounce the dead man's conviction, and the confiscation of his estates and dignities. Mortimer, a fugitive in Ireland, was ordered to appear to stand his trial within three months. If he remained in hiding, his absence was to be regarded as proof of his treason.

The time of punishment was over, and that of the rewards at once followed. By an unprecedented lavishing of honours, hitherto sparingly bestowed, the king's supporters received ample recognition. Five new dukedoms were created. These went to the two renegades of the old appeal, Nottingham and Derby, who became dukes of Norfolk and Hereford; to the king's brother Huntingdon, who was made duke of Exeter; and to his nephew, Kent, and his cousin, Rutland, who became dukes of Surrey and Albemarle. Norfolk himself was further honoured by his old grandmother, the still surviving daughter of Thomas of Brotherton, being made duchess of Norfolk for life. The

¹ The official version, notified by letters patent on Apr. 3, 1398, was that Gloucester died on "the Saturday before the feast of St. Lambert," that is, Sept. 15, 1397. This was ascertained "by divers inquests taken by escheators in divers counties in England"; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 323. For Gloucester's death see Professor Tait's article in *Manchester University Historical Essays* (1902 and 1907), pp. 193-216, "Did Richard II. murder the duke of Gloucester?" Some of these conclusions have to be modified in the light of two papers in *E.H.R.* xxxviii. on "Richard II. and the Death of the Duke of Gloucester," by Mr. A. E. Stamp (pp. 249-251) and Mr. R. L. Atkinson (pp. 563-564). In particular, the view that Gloucester's death was generally known when Rickhill was sent to Calais must be abandoned, and the argument as to the falsification of the parliamentary records requires restatement. This latter point should be reconsidered in the light of the problem of the parliamentary committee set up at Shrewsbury. For this see later, pp. 35-41.

Lancastrian cousin of the king, the earl of Somerset, became marquis of Dorset, while the four new earldoms of Gloucester, Westmorland, Worcester and Wiltshire, rewarded the services of Thomas Despenser, Ralph Neville, Thomas Percy and William Scrope. All these new dignitaries were of good blood, the majority closely akin to the king, and none, with the possible exception of Scrope, could be regarded as a parvenu. The distribution of forfeited estates among them did something to enhance their territorial position. Yet the people spoke of the over numerous dukes as "dukelings,"¹ and the cheapening of titles weakened the repute of the novel hierarchy of honour.

Richard took care to secure for himself a share of the booty. Again the complaisant commons were called upon to initiate a statute, passed in a day, in which the king, out of his "affection for his county of Chester and its inhabitants," ordained that it should henceforth be the principality of Chester, with all its ancient liberties. The limits of the palatinate were extended by the inclusion within it of the forfeited Fitzalan estates in the March of Wales, Bromfield and Yale, Oswestry, Chirkland and Clun.² It was permanently annexed to the crown, and only alienable to the eldest son of the king. Richard also assumed for the crown the hereditary shrievalty of Worcestershire, fallen into his hands by Warwick's forfeiture. Now too, if not earlier, he added to his arms the so-called "arms of Edward the Confessor," his special saint.

The last step to be taken was to ensure the permanence of

¹ *Ann. Ric.* p. 223: "quos vulgares derisorie vocabant non duces sed dukettos a diminutivo."

² *Rot. Parl.* iii. 354, give the details. "Le chastel Lyons" is of course Holt; "le chastel Isabelle," also called "Philip's castle" is in the parish of Shrawardine, Salop, and "le chastel de Daliley" appears to be Dawley, near Shiffnal. The last two places are within the limits of Shropshire, and encompass Shrewsbury on west and east. The reason of their inclusion was probably that they were both former Fitzalan possessions. Clun was granted to the new duke of Albemarle for his life; but it was to be held as a fief of the principality, and on Albemarle's death to revert to it. At first there seems to have been some hesitation as to whether the new franchise was to be called a duchy or principality. See for instance, *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 205, the grant to Albemarle of Clun, on Sept. 28, on condition of homage "nobis tanquam duci Cestrie," and p. 204, describing on Sept. 29 a person as "de ducatu Cestrie." Compare Evesham, p. 139, "comitatus Cestriae ad honorem ducatus sublimatur." But the statute clearly made it a principality, and naturally, when duchies were so cheap.

the new system. Again, "at the request of the commons," there was high mass in Westminster abbey on Sunday, September 30, after which a specified list of lords spiritual and temporal took oaths, before the shrine of the Confessor and in the presence of the king, to observe, perpetually, the laws and judgments passed in the present parliament, saving only to the king his regality. Then the knights of the shire took the same oath together, with a high voice and with right hands upraised. Thomas Percy took the oath on behalf of the clergy of the realm, and last of all, the bishops fulminated excommunication against all who might presume to reverse the proceedings of parliament. This was the last act of the session, except for the concluding feast, and parliament stood adjourned to meet again at Shrewsbury on January 27, 1398.

The Shrewsbury meeting was even shorter than the session at Westminster. Any faint breath of criticism such as had occasionally arisen at Westminster was not likely to be felt in the immediate neighbourhood of the principality of Chester, whose faithful archers could easily be called in to suppress any disturbance. Four days sufficed to put the coping-stones on the Ricardian despotism. At the prayer of seven of the eight new appellants, the judgments and acts of the Merciless Parliament were at last repealed as usurpations on the prerogative, outside the sphere of parliamentary competence. This, combined with the revocation of the acts of 1386 in September, left the king's position as it was in the days of Suffolk and the duke of Ireland. Accordingly, it was regarded as a declaration of good law when the judges assured the estates that, had they been consulted, they would have come to the conclusion that the judges of 1387 had reached at Shrewsbury and Nottingham. The earldom of Suffolk was restored to earl Michael's heir. The trials, begun at Westminster, were completed by the condemnation of the venerable John Cobham to exile in the Channel Islands, and the sentence of the absent Thomas Mortimer to a traitor's doom. At the initiative of the new earl of Gloucester, the judgments against his grandfather and great-grandfather, the two Hugh Despencers of 1326, were annulled. Even Alice Perrers' claims for the reversal of her sentence in the Good Parliament were heard with consideration. A liberal subsidy was provided, and

the customs on wool, hitherto allowed for short periods only,¹ were granted to the king for life, and assured him of a reasonable income, independent of further parliamentary grants.

Oaths were again imposed to maintain the reformed constitution for all time, on this occasion on the cross of Canterbury. The earl of March, suspected of harbouring his uncle Thomas, was specially summoned to Shrewsbury and took this oath. A new and stricter definition of treason was accepted which condemned as treason any attempt to reverse the acts or judgments of the present parliament. No precaution was omitted to make the new departure permanent and irrevocable. Richard was seriously disturbed that he could find no means of binding future kings never to reverse the new acts. In later times it was believed that he obtained from the pope a confirmation of the new ordinances of parliament and caused this to be publicly proclaimed at Paul's Cross.²

There was good reason to be apprehensive of the future, since already there was a rift within the victorious coalition. We have seen that only seven of the eight appellants of September united in procuring the abrogation of the legislation of 1388. The eighth was the new duke of Norfolk, who was already on bad terms with his associates and profoundly suspicious of the king's good faith. So far back as December, he had unburdened his soul to the duke of Hereford, as they were riding between Brentford and London. The king and his inner circle, Norfolk maintained, had not yet forgotten or forgiven Radcot bridge, and were only biding their time to ruin the parties to the appeal of 1387. The duke of Surrey, the earls of Wiltshire, Salisbury and Gloucester, had formed a conspiracy to undo the other lords of the appeal, and also the duke of Lancaster. If they could not effect their purpose for the moment, they would be content to wait ten years for their triumph. Rumours of this conversation reached the king, who, some days before the parliament re-assembled at Shrewsbury, insisted on Hereford setting down an account of it in writing. On January 30, 1398, Hereford, at the king's request, told the whole story to parliament. A new and stormy chapter seemed about to be written in the history of that

¹ Evesham, p. 145, "quas non habebat (rex) antea nisi ex rogatu."

² Gregory's *Chronicle*, pp. 98-100.

parliament, but the king had already gained his chief points and was anxious to avoid fresh trouble. On Thursday, January 31, the next day, a short cut was taken to avoid more debate or publicity, by the adoption of a resolution, as usual on the petition of the commons, that a committee of eighteen should be set up to consider certain petitions which had neither been read nor answered by reason of lack of time, with full parliamentary power to determine those petitions. This commission included ten magnates, the two magnate proctors of the clergy, and six knights of the shire. Of these there must be present to form a quorum, six representatives from the magnates and clergy, and three from the knights.¹ The same eighteen commissioners were separately empowered, "with the assent of all the estates of parliament," to discuss and settle the matters contained in the complaint of the duke of Hereford. For this purpose the quorum was slightly modified to six lords, one clerical proctor and three or four knights,² a proctor from the clergy being apparently thought necessary for cases involving judicial judgments. Then the subsidy was formally granted, a general pardon pronounced with the proviso, "from the king's own mouth," that if future lords or commons raised difficulties in the execution of the grant for life, the pardon was to be considered void. Then the expenses writs were issued and the estates scattered. Four days of frenzied debate had sufficed to consummate the royalist revolution. Well might Richard boast that he had destroyed his enemies not only in the bark but in the root.³

Thus, after ten years of weary waiting, Richard II. had won the authority which he had persistently claimed as inherent in the idea of monarchy. The chroniclers denounce the long-continued dissimulation which enabled the king to hold his hand so long and yet to strike with such deadly effect at the right moment. Yet it required both intelligence and character to pursue his purpose over many years, and Richard must not be denied the

¹ *Rot. Parl.* iii. 368. The magnate commissioners were the dukes of Lancaster, York, Albemarle, Surrey and Exeter, the marquis of Dorset, the earls of March, Salisbury, Northumberland, Gloucester, Worcester and Wilts. The knights of the shire were Bushy, H. Green, J. Russell, Richard Chelmswick, Robert Tey and John Golafre. All of them were king's knights or esquires, holding court office.

² *Rot. Parl.* iii. 360.

³ "Nedum ad corticem sed ad radicem contrivimus"; *Beckington Letters*, i. 287, Rolls Ser.

credit of his political acumen. His methods were as subtly devised as his end was clearly conceived. He was astute enough to break up the united front of the great houses, which when concentrated on a single purpose, the greatest of English monarchs had found irresistible. He had kept the old nobility aloof from his court and society, and had played off rival houses against each other. He had erected a new nobility of his kinsmen and dependents, strong enough to neutralise the ancient houses, and he had further increased his control of parliament by persuading the popes to provide his clerical favourites and supporters with bishoprics. Above all, he had transferred the leadership of the commons from the magnates to the crown, and had thereby been able to use the commons as the instrument for the undoing of his enemies. His policy was a subtler and more successful variant of the policy of Edward II. and the Despensers. It anticipated in some essential features the policy by which the Tudors established strong monarchy, in playing off the house of commons against the aristocracy, and in sapping the independence of the house of lords by nominating peers and bishops bound to unqualified support of the sovereign.

How did Richard use the power he had so cleverly won? How far was he capable of playing the part of an autocrat? Events soon answered these questions. Richard's opportunity was a short one, but it was long enough to demonstrate his futility. His freedom to act as he wished only lasted from February 1398 to May 1399. On going to Ireland, he handed over his authority to deputies even more incompetent than himself, and when their failure brought him back to England, he was forced to abandon his crown without a struggle. Thus only twenty months elapsed between the triumph of Shrewsbury and the capitulation at Conway and the Tower. Richard's inability to live up to his ideals of autocracy is writ large on the history of that short period.

One primary cause of Richard's failure was his personal character. Some kingly qualities he undoubtedly possessed, but he lacked the elasticity, the pertinacity and the common sense required for a successful ruler. His mind had been formed when he was struggling, under adverse conditions, to acquire the rights which he conceived to be inherent in his office, and the gifts which

secured his emancipation were of little avail when he came to control policy and direct administration. He had not that essential quality of the true autocrat, capacity for hard work and continued application. What he was too idle and spasmodic to do himself, he was too suspicious to delegate to others. Equipped, in all probability, with limited intellectual powers, he hardly seemed to know what to do with his newly won freedom. He had not been encouraged in the old days to attend councils or transact business, and he made no effort now to acquire these habits. His victory seems to have turned his head, for he was more delighted in the show than in the exercise of power. Flatterers, like Bushy, had won his favour by approaching him with obeisances and compliments, which would have seemed ridiculous to his predecessors. We must not overstress the testimony of hostile chroniclers, but they are at one in imputing to him love of the externals of monarchy and neglect of its substance. We are told, for instance, that at the solemn festivals Richard, decked out in royal array, sat on his throne from dinner-time to vespers, speaking to no one, but looking at every one in turn, and whatever the rank of the person on whom the royal glance fell, he was expected to bend his knee to his sovereign.¹

Not unnaturally Richard was restless and ill at ease. His enemies believed that his conscience was troubled by Gloucester's murder and that he was afraid of the hostility of his subjects,² especially of the ill-will of the Londoners and the men of the neighbouring counties. For this reason he was rarely to be seen in London, but wandered almost without pause through the Midlands, surrounded by his unruly bodyguard of Cheshire men, always adding to the numbers of the household retinue,³ and seeing little of his ministers, except the kinsmen and knights of the household to whom he gave his chief confidence. After the Shrewsbury parliament, he made a long tour in the west, working his way slowly through Hereford, Worcester, Gloucester and

¹ *Cont. Eul. Hist.* iii. 378.

² His officials had apparently similar fears. See, for instance, the protection of May 4, 1398, for two years to the king's esquire, Geoffrey Chaucer, sent upon urgent affairs of the king to divers parts of England, and fearing molestation from rivals by complaints or suits; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 329; *Foedera*, viii. 39.

³ Thus on one day, Mar. 22, 1398, at Bath, the king retained seventeen esquires "to stay with the king for life," each with ten marks a year; and five knights, each with twenty marks a year; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 321-324.

Bristol to London.¹ The large number of writs issued during February and March at various stages of the journey, suggests that he was accompanied by chancery and other officers. We know that on January 12 orders were issued for the carriage of the chancery rolls from London to Shrewsbury,² and it looks as if, after parliament had dissolved, the chancery tarried at Coventry before its return to Westminster. During this period writs were still occasionally sealed there; but it was not until April that Westminster again recovered its position as the normal administrative centre, and even then Richard was seldom personally in residence. He led a wandering life, being at Lichfield in May, whence he corresponded under the signet with his council in London,³ and remained mainly in the Midlands until the autumn. Between April 1398 and May 1399 the presence of the chancery at Westminster is shown by most chancery writs being sealed there, except for brief periods between the end of June and the end of July 1398, when chancery seems to have been with the king at Nottingham and Leicester; again in September, when Richard was at Coventry for the duel of Hereford and Norfolk; and afterwards at Leicester and Northampton on his way back to the south. Richard preferred to live in the Midlands. He spent Christmas 1398 at Lichfield with his old confessor, bishop Burghill, amusing himself with tournaments and feasts of extraordinary magnificence.⁴ The king's bench still often followed the court, being ordered to be at Coventry

¹ Evesham, p. 145: "Post hoc parliamentum visitavit rex multa loca Angliae, viz. Herfordiam, Wygorniam, Hanleyam, Haille, Wyncecomb, Gloucestriam, Bristolliam, Britaniam et alia, redeundo London." "Hanleyam" is, I suspect, Hanley castle, near Upton on Severn, a manor of the Despensers. The other places are obvious, except "Britaniam," as to which I cannot even guess. It is, of course, unsafe to argue the king's presence from the dating of chancery writs, but it is of some significance that there were patents dated on Feb. 8, Lichfield; Feb. 11, Clifton Campville (north of Tamworth); Feb. 12-25, Coventry; Mar. 1-8, Worcester; Mar. 7, Evesham; Mar. 8, Winchcomb; Mar. 8-14, Gloucester; Mar. 17-19, Bristol; Mar. 22, Bath and Chippenham; Mar. 25-28, Bristol. Most of this time writs were also dated Westminster. During this progress Richard had Hereford and Norfolk before him on Feb. 23 at Oswestry, and also held the first meeting of the parliamentary committee on Mar. 19 at Bristol. See later, p. 36. It is clear that the itineraries of the king and of the chancery were by no means always the same, but they were still in some sort of relation to each other.

² *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 275.

³ *A.P.C.* i. 80-81.

⁴ Evesham, p. 148, "in palatio episcopi." On Scrope being translated to York, John Burghill had been translated to Lichfield from Llandaff.

for November 3, and at Worcester for January 20.¹ At last he returned to the south, where he remained until he ventured, despite his fear of the Londoners and Kentishmen, to make a short pilgrimage to Canterbury.² There archbishop Walden lavishly entertained him and his Cheshire guards. Richard's motive was to obtain St. Thomas' blessing for his Irish campaign. In May 1399, he left London for his second expedition to Ireland, only to return nearly four months later to be deposed.

¶ The question naturally arises whether Richard's assumption of absolute power involved any changes in the administrative machinery of the English state. Speaking roughly, the answer to this must be in the negative. Only one important novelty resulted from Richard's autocracy, and this seems to have been due to accident rather than to design. We have spoken already of the permanent commission of eighteen which the Shrewsbury parliament appointed just before its dissolution. Apparently an innovation, there were yet certain precedents for such a delegation. In an earlier period, before the full emergence of the power of the commons, it had not been unusual for the magnates to remain in session after the commons had been sent home. A truncated parliament with representatives, chosen by the crown, from different estates, had met in 1371 at Winchester to deal with business left over from the parliament at Westminster in the spring of that year.³ The Merciless Parliament itself had requested that the bills and petitions which could not be answered for lack of time should be dealt with by certain lords assigned for the purpose, whose decisions should have the same force as resolutions in full parliament.⁴ It is a good instance of Richard's long memory of the events of 1388 that he should hoist the appellants with their own petard by the commission of 1398.

The acts appointing the commission did not go much beyond the precedents, and its authority was clearly limited to two definite objects. In the first place, it was given power to determine

¹ A royal order to council now sufficed for this. But may not the "Wircestre" of *MS. Cotton, Cleopatra*, F. iii. f. 8b, really be an error for Westminster? The date assigned to this act by Nicolas must be a year too early, as it speaks of Cobham's forfeited estates, and Cobham was not condemned until the Shrewsbury parliament in Jan. 1398.

² *Cont. Eul. Hist.* iii. 379-80; *A.P.C.* i. 75.

³ See above, iii. 268-270.

⁴ See above, iii. 438.

petitions unanswered for lack of time; and in the second place, the same persons were separately assigned, with a slightly different quorum, to deal with the charges brought by Hereford against Norfolk.¹ The precedent of 1371 was followed in royal nomination of its members, and in the meticulous choice of representatives of each of the three estates the precedent was improved upon. In the first recorded session of the commission on March 19, 1398, at Bristol, its work was strictly within its scope. Five unanswered petitions were dealt with, and the conclusions of the commission were embodied in laws duly entered on the statute roll. Unless Hereford could produce sufficient proofs of his charges against Norfolk, it was resolved that their quarrel should be settled by trial by battle. This meeting of the commission is also described as that of a council.²

The second meeting of the commission took place on April 29 at Windsor, and its sole business was to settle the dispute between the two dukes. Norfolk made some incriminating admissions, but it was agreed that no sufficient evidence of the truth of Hereford's accusations had been produced and that the case must therefore be fought out between them. On this occasion "those who had the authority of parliament" were afforded by the "dukes, earls, barons, bannerets and a great multitude of the chivalry of England."³ The parliamentary commission was already playing the part of the "great councils" of the earlier part of the reign, and could be strengthened, if need be, by other counsellors summoned for the purpose.

The duel between the two dukes, assigned to take place at Coventry on September 16, was the occasion of the third meeting of the parliamentary commission. The stopping of the duel was the personal act of the king, but the banishment of both of the rivals—Hereford for ten years, and Norfolk for life—was made

¹ In discussing the problem of the commission I have made full use of Mr. J. G. Edwards' valuable article on "The Parliamentary Committee of 1398" in *E.H.R.* xl. 321-333. I am in full agreement with his general conclusions. He has shown that the consideration of the Hereford-Norfolk controversy was strictly within its scope, but he has omitted to make clear the twofold origin of the commission and the different quorum necessary for dealing with the Hereford-Norfolk business. The records of appointment do not imply that the two bodies consisted of the same persons.

² "Le roy . . . a son conseil tenez a Bristuit"; *Rot. Parl.* iii. 383.

³ *Ib.* p. 383.

“by full advice and assent of parliament,” a phrase which can only be interpreted as the consent of the parliamentary commission. With the conclusion of this business, its existence should naturally have come to an end. But the king was already at his wits’ end for further supplies, and his imposition of arbitrary forced loans had excited the liveliest opposition. The violence of his bodyguard and the caprices of his ministers had roused a storm of indignation. In such circumstances it was rash to expect help from parliament. Was not an easy way out of Richard’s troubles a prolongation of the parliamentary commission and an extension of its powers?

By the early months of 1399 the commission had already lost two of the most distinguished, and one of the most insignificant, of its members. On August 15, 1398, Roger, earl of March, was slain in battle against the rebel Irish, having already given indications of an independence, unchecked even by his prospect of succession to the throne. On February 3, 1399, the death of John of Gaunt robbed the commission of its most exalted member and raised the problem of the admission of the banished duke of Hereford to the succession to his inheritance. One of the commons, the member for Shropshire, Richard Chelmswick or Chelmerswick, king’s esquire and steward of Cornwall, was also dead before the autumn of 1398.¹ Of the fifteen surviving members there was not one likely to raise his voice against the king’s wishes. The four dukes—York, Albemarle, Surrey and Exeter—were entirely subservient, and so was the marquis of Dorset, who bore no goodwill to his brother, Hereford. The earls of Salisbury and Gloucester were equally complaisant. The two brothers—Northumberland and Worcester—might be relied upon to seek their own interest, but they still identified it with the interest of the crown. The earl of Wiltshire, who shared with Worcester the duties of proctor for the clergy, had been, on September 17, 1398, promoted to the treasurership of the exchequer.² Since January 1398 he had been justice of North

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 410. I follow Mr. Edwards in identifying the member of the commission with Richard Chelmswick or Cholmwyke, deceased before Sept. 7. I think, however, that he is wrong in supposing Golafre’s death early in 1399. He confuses the king’s esquire with his father, the chamber knight, already dead some time. The index of *C.P.R.* hopelessly combines the two generations in a single heading.

² See later, pp. 49-50, 57-59.

Wales and Chester for life, and he probably still remained vice-chamberlain, with each accession of power growing ever stauncher in his devotion to the crown. When peers of high rank were thus submissive, little could be expected from the five commoners who had been carefully selected from the most obsequious knights at Shrewsbury. The most important were Bushy, the Speaker; Henry Green, his active associate in managing the late parliament; and John Russell,¹ all three king's knights, retained at high salaries for perpetual attendance at court in peace and war. The other two—John Golafre and Robert Teye—were younger men, king's esquires on their promotion, and retained to the court for life.²

It must have been in the spring of 1399 that the audacious idea came into the king's mind to turn the commission, whose limited authority was already exhausted, into a body which might pose for a further period as the legitimate representative of parliament for all purposes. So far the commissioners had not gone beyond their legal powers. The one act which might be so construed—the reaffirmation, at the Bristol meeting, of the statute made in parliament, declaring it treason to repeal any of the acts of the 1397 parliament—was a mere flourish for precaution or publicity which added nothing to the law of the land. Now, great extensions of their powers were contemplated, and the crown did not hesitate to falsify the rolls of parliament to obtain colourable warrant for such assumptions.³ The commission was supposed to have authority, beyond the work it had already done,

¹ For Bushy and Green see above, pp. 12-14. Russell had long done "good and gratuitous service" as "keeper of the king's great horses," and had received liberal grants; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 314-315. He is only less conspicuous than Bushy and Green as a councillor and wirepuller for the king. He was member for Worcestershire.

² John Golafre was the son of Sir John Golafre, chamber knight, recently deceased, and disliked as the agent of Richard in suspected negotiations for the surrender of Calais. He represented Oxfordshire, and is called in the writ, "Jankin Golafre." Robert Teye was member for Essex. Both are described as "chivalers" in *Rot. Parl.*, but it is clear that neither were yet technically knights, though "knights of the shire."

³ This is well worked out by Mr. J. G. Edwards in the article already quoted, after an inspection of the MSS. of the roll of 1397. The best MS. appoints the commission "pur terminer petitions." The tampered roll adds "et autres choses," and includes among its powers the determination of "toutes autres matiers et choses moeuez en presence du roy et toutes les dependences dicelles nient determinez solonc ceo qe meulx lour semblera." See also Professor Tait's article on Richard II. in *D.N.B.*

to terminate "all other matters and things moved in the king's presence in accordance with what seems best to them." It was summoned to meet for a fourth time on March 18, 1399, at Westminster, to revoke the letters patent allowing Hereford to appoint attorneys to receive any inheritance that might accrue to him.¹ This revocation was carried at the meeting on March 18, in the presence of the king, after the chancellor had shown how such letters patent, incompatible with the sentence at Coventry, had been inadvertently granted. Thirteen of the sixteen commissioners accepted this monstrous doctrine, and ordered the letters to be cancelled.² At the same meeting Sir Robert Pleasington, the sometime chief baron, who had died in 1393, was formally condemned as a traitor,³ because, twelve years before, he had been the spokesman of the appellants in the Merciless Parliament. That Richard intended still further to use the commission is evident from the terms of his testament, drawn up on April 16, in which he revoked his bequests to his successor, if he neglected to uphold past and future ordinances and judgments, made by its authority.⁴ Five days later, on April 23, he held another meeting of the commission at Windsor. Here Henry Bowet, constable of Bordeaux,⁵ whose real crime may well have been his desertion of Richard's service in 1388 for that of the house of Lancaster,⁶ was condemned as a traitor. For the commission to act as a standing judicial tribunal to punish

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 417, shows not only Hereford, but his retinue, were granted on Oct. 3, 1398, letters of general attorney to be renewed yearly. *Ib.* p. 422 similarly allows such license to Norfolk, and to his retinue and continuous council of nine, of whom four were knights and two clerks. An exiled and disgraced duke still needed, and was allowed, a large body of advisers.

² *Rot. Parl.* iii. 372. A similar patent to Norfolk was also cancelled. The marquis of Dorset in Henry IV.'s first parliament describes thus the meeting: "Il fust un conseil tenuz en une chaumbre deins le paleys de Westminster, en manere come un parlement"; *ib.* iii. 450. The roll describes these acts as done by those "aiantz a ceo poair par vertue et auctorite du parlement." Allowing for dead men (see above, p. 37), the only absentees at this meeting were the duke of Surrey, who was in Ireland, and John Golafre.

³ *Ib.* iii. 384. See also above, iii. 357, 360, and pp. 416, 431.

⁴ *Foedera*, viii. 77. "Omnes ordinationes et iudicia quae auctoritate eiusdem parliamenti in futuro contigerit fieri."

⁵ Bowet, on July 19, 1397, had been made chief judge in Aquitaine, and on July 23, 1398, constable of Bordeaux; *Foedera*, viii. 7, 43.

⁶ *Rot. Parl.* iii. 385. In Henry IV.'s first parliament Bowet, then one of his chief confidants, was mentioned as one of those exempted from the general pardon issued in 1388 to the partisans of the king; *ib.* iii. 428. For Bowet's later career see *D.N.B.*

Richard's few enemies, who, dead or alive, had not already been condemned, was a startling addition to its functions.

This was the final meeting of the commission. It looks as if it had served its purpose in condemning the last objects of Richard's ill-will, and that he had no further use for it. Anyhow, when a few weeks later he started on his Irish journey, he neglected to take with him a sufficient quorum of its members to make Irish sessions of it possible.¹ Considering the activity of the commission in the fifteen months succeeding the Shrewsbury parliament, it is no wonder that the majority of contemporary chroniclers² and most modern historians agree in regarding the extension of the scope of the commission as indicative of a deliberate design of Richard to do away with representative parliaments altogether. Yet this view cannot altogether be substantiated. The persistence with which the acts done by the commission are quoted as done by the "authority of parliament," suggests that Richard was willing enough to have parliamentary authorisation for his proceedings.³ Moreover, the brevity of mediaeval life, which had already reduced materially the numbers of the commission, would soon have made ridiculous the faint pretext that it possessed representative character. Even the method adopted of recording its proceedings in the rolls of the Shrewsbury parliament is evidence of the absence of any permanent design. Such rolls could not be kept open indefinitely, and, as they stand, their puzzling repetitions, divisions and contradictions suggest, if not fraud, extreme negligence in their

¹ I owe this point to Mr. Edwards, who shows conclusively that Wallon, *Richard II.* ii. 237, is wrong in asserting the contrary. More than a quorum of magnates went to Ireland with the king, but the only commoner was his esquire, Robert Teye.

² The most accurate appreciation of the situation is shown in the *Ann. Ric.* p. 222, which say that its original purpose was "ad terminandum dissolutio parlamento certas petitiones," but goes on as follows: "cujus concessionis colore personae sic deputatae processerunt ad alia generaliter parlamentum illud tangencia." To facilitate this object "rex . . . fecit rotulos parlamenti mutari et deleri." The chronicler's only error is in saying that the number of the commission was six or eight. This may perhaps be explained by the assumption that he excluded the magnates, including or not including the two clerical proctors. This passage is substantially repeated in Walsingham, ii. 226-227. *Cont. Evl. Hist.* iii. 377-378, and Usk, p. 24, are less precise in detail but equally wrong as to numbers. Usk gives "ad vitae suae terminum" as the duration of its power.

³ See for instance, *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 420, 422, where Norfolk's banishment is described as "by authority of the last parliament."

compilation.¹ It must be admitted, however, that the delegation of parliamentary work to a small committee must, in the long run, have sapped the authority of the estates, and we must not forget that Richard's theory of sovereignty involved absolute autocracy and left no independence or initiative to parliament. I am inclined to regard his conception of the commission as a substitute for the "great councils" of which we heard so much in earlier years of the reign.² Such a body might well have supplemented and strengthened the purely administrative councils on which Richard relied for the transaction of daily business. A parliament might still be summoned, if it suited the king's interests.

Apart from the commission, Richard was content to govern through the traditional offices of administration. It would seem natural that he should particularly favour those connected with his household, and there is evidence that the king's secretary and signet now came to be regarded as normal elements of the administrative machine. The experience of the privy seal was at the disposal of the new signet office, when clerks of the one were also employed at the other.³ But the occasional employment of the signet to seal patents "in the absence of the great seal,"⁴ the instructions to sheriffs to obey letters under the signet equally with the other seals,⁵ and the increasing prominence of the king's secretary were only developments of a process that was already well begun. It is significant that Richard never used the signet in these years in the wholesale fashion he had employed it in the early years of his authority. All that he seems to have been anxious to secure was that it should have a legitimate, though modest, place among the accredited instruments of his

¹ Of the five meetings, four are exclusively recorded in the "placita corone" roll; *Rot. Parl.* iii. 382-385. The record of the proceedings of Mar. 18, 1399, is divided. While the condemnation of Pleasington goes with the other four, the revocation of the patents to appoint attorneys is set down in the ordinary roll on *ib.* p. 372. The "placita corone" roll is throughout suspicious. It is carelessly and inaccurately put together and contains repetitions and minor contradictions.

² The assemblies of the commission are sometimes spoken of as "councils," though this may be interpreted as meaning that the council also met at the same time.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 463, shows that Robert Frye, king's clerk, had "twelve years good services in the offices of the privy seal and the signet."

⁴ *Ann. Ric.* p. 236. ⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1399-1401, p. 28, a grant of Oct. 1, 1398.

will. When he could use great and privy seals at his discretion, why trouble himself with increasing the authority of the signet ?

As with the signet, so with the chamber, and we shall see later in more detail that there was no wide extension of either chamber or signet during these years of autocracy.¹ There was indeed no necessity for such. Administrative changes, like those of the Dispensers, to further the interests of prerogative, presupposed the control, partial or complete, of the great offices of state by ministers responsible to the barons as well as the crown. But the conflict between the private administrative offices of the monarch and the public offices of the state had now become matter of ancient history. The permanent administrative machinery had now been stabilised by generations of use and wont. Whether the final word belonged to the king or to the aristocracy, the offices and officials were the same. The chancery, the exchequer, the privy seal, the two benches and the various local authorities had each its well-defined sphere. Each tended to acquire a more clearly cut individuality, but each became an integral part of a single public service. The household offices in the same way were co-ordinated more and more with the public offices in a general scheme. Whosoever controlled the central state controlled also its various departments. The chief limitations to his power were the scantiness of the public resources, the necessity of depending on unpaid officials, and the impossibility of carrying through a policy so unpopular that officials declined to execute it and subjects to submit to it. Against these rocks the autocracy of Richard II. was soon to be shattered.

If Richard attempted any further innovations, it was in asserting his authority over the instruments of local government. We have only to turn over the pages of the Calendars of Chancery Rolls to see the enormous number of local authorities, and the innumerable temporary commissions, judicial and administrative, which the crown was always calling into being. Outside the franchises, these minor officers of the state owed their power to royal delegation, but they seldom received any definite rewards for their services and were scattered over the country in small groups, difficult to control. Country gentlemen of position, they were little amenable to central pressure, and were more likely to

¹ See later, pp. 342-343, and vol. v. ch. xvii. § IV.

voice the views of their class, or district, than to be the executors of orders from above. This was especially true of the officers who had a long tradition behind them, such as the sheriffs, the escheators, and even the justices of the peace and of labourers. Their problem was whether they were to represent the king, the locality or their own class. There is not much doubt but that, in the long run, they tended to represent the interests of the locality, or class, rather than the point of view of the crown. Hence the endless struggle of the central authority to exercise control over its local representatives, a struggle the more interminable since the state neither abandoned its pretensions nor possessed the executive force to give effect to them.

In such periods as the reign of Richard II. trouble of this sort became inevitable. From time to time the commons demanded the yearly appointment of sheriffs, and were told, as for instance in 1397, that the king considered reappointment of sheriffs who had learnt their duties by experience was the only way in which the work of the office could be satisfactorily discharged.¹ It was a feature of the new autocracy to continue beyond their year of office any sheriff who showed himself complaisant to the crown, and to put a royal nominee, if possible a member of the household, into such sheriffdoms as fell vacant. The articles, drawn up later, as grounds for depriving Richard of his throne, state that, notwithstanding the statute providing that sheriffs were to be nominated to the crown by the ministers, justices and other councillors, the king rejected such as were recommended, and appointed at his own pleasure members of his household and other persons who would not resist his wishes.²

An examination of the list of sheriffs between 1397 and 1399 shows that there was considerable colour for this charge. Eighteen sheriffdoms, including twenty-one shires, had each the same sheriff for the whole period of Richard's autocracy. Of these, eight sheriffdoms, including eleven shires, had as their sheriffs members of the king's household,³ and it is, of course,

¹ *Rot. Parl.* iii. 339.

² *Ib.* iii. 419, § 30. "Rex non nominatos aut electos huiusmodi sed alios pro sue libito voluntatis, quandoque suos familiares et quandoque tales quos scivit nolle resistere voluntati sue in vicecomites fieri demandavit."

³ The details are as follows: Beds and Bucks, John Worship (yeoman of the king's cuphouse, 1377-90; king's esquire, 1390; usher of the chamber, 1395).

impossible to discover the sheriffs who were considered unable to stand up against the crown. Clearly successful effort had been made to attune local government to the king's will. On sheriffs, thus carefully selected, the king is said to have imposed new oaths to obey his commands, whether expressed under the great or privy seals, or by signet letters.¹ He also was believed to have instructed them to imprison any of their bailiffs or agents who had spoken to the king's dishonour.² The ubiquitous activities of the king's sergeants-at-arms, who collected loans and taxes, impressed men and ships, served on local commissions, and in all sorts of ways interfered with the course of local administration and justice, suggest another method whereby Richard's personal servants supplemented the normal local authorities.³

Another development of ancient abuses was Richard's wide extension of the use of household and prerogative courts for chastising those who dared to criticise or resist the Lord's anointed. Informers and spies were encouraged. Those accused, often maliciously, through such agents, were imprisoned and brought before the courts of chivalry, in which the constable and marshal judged the case by martial law.⁴ Sometimes the judges

Cambs and Hunts, Andrew Newport (sergeant-at-arms, 1386-89; king's esquire, 1392; warden of the mint for life; keeper of the exchange in the Tower, alderman, and M.P. for city of London, 1397-98). Hereford, Thomas Clanvow (king's knight). Oxon and Berks, John Golafre (king's esquire, retained for life; M.P. for Oxon, 1397; member of the parliamentary commission). Salop, A. Peshall (keeper of Dawley castle). Staffs, W. Walsall (king's knight and marshal of hall). Wilts, R. Mawardyn (king's esquire). To these may be added Cheshire, Robert Legh (king's knight, constable of Oswestry). We have thus five king's esquires, two king's knights, and two keepers of castles in the principality of Chester, acting as sheriffs. We may perhaps add, as an instance of a royal dependent, Norfolk and Suffolk, William Rees, a former life retainer of Arundel, whose grants were confirmed by the king in Nov. 1397; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 255. This list, based on P.R.O. *List of Sheriffs* and the Calendars of Patent Rolls, is only a rough approximation to exactitude, but is perhaps enough to prove the point.

¹ *Ann. Ric.* p. 236.

² *Ib.* Records bear out the allegations of the chronicler. Thus, the parson of Sibsey, Lincs., forfeited chattels worth £40 "because he spoke ill of the king's person," for which he was sentenced to be "infra clausam Lincolnie" for life. The incident is recorded because the chattels were granted to four "king's servants of the chamber" on Mar. 22, 1398; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 321-322. Compare, however, *ib.* p. 283.

³ See for this, *C.P.R.*, 1396-99 *passim*, notably pp. 363-364, 368, 433, 438, 439, 442; and later, p. 56.

⁴ A legal expert generally supplied the place of the nominal judge. Thus Sir John Cheyne, king's knight, often acted for the constable (*C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 58, 83), and sometimes refused suitors a hearing.

refused to hear the case. Sometimes the answer to a charge was a blank denial supplemented by a proffer to prove innocence by trial by battle. However old, infirm or sick the accused might be, they were forced to defend themselves against accusers or appellants who were both young and strong.¹ The duel at Coventry was not a solitary case; a little earlier the king took a special delight in preparing the lists for a similar trial by battle at Bristol. Before long, not only magnates but commons were exposed to this barbarous travesty of justice. The transference of the offices of constable and marshal of England from Gloucester to Albemarle, and from Norfolk to Surrey, first secured for the king's intimates complete control of the court of chivalry.

In the same way the admiralty courts, despite the limitations imposed upon them by the parliaments of 1389 and 1391, developed another prerogative jurisdiction which withdrew many cases from the common law.² That this was of importance to the prerogative is shown by Richard securing the position of admiral for men whom he could trust implicitly—his brother John, duke of Exeter; his cousins, Edward of York, and John Beaufort, marquis of Dorset. We may perhaps see in the revival, in favour of Rutland, of the ancient title of justice of the forest, which had been disused since the Ordinances of 1311, an effort to revive the dignity and authority of the forest courts.³ Even the remarkable extension of the chancellor's jurisdiction was, in such friendly hands as those of Edmund Stafford, another support to prerogative and a further restriction to the sphere of common law.

Richard had an advantage over his predecessors in his command of a military force. He is the one English despot before Oliver Cromwell who had something of an army at his beck and call. We have seen how often he tried to swell the

¹ *Ann. Ric.* pp. 236-237.

² See above, iii. 468. Appeals from both the admiralty and the constable's court of chivalry went often to special commissions appointed *ad hoc*. See, for instance, *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 23, 58, 83, 102-103, 165, which are all cases where Mr. Ralph Selby, doctor of laws and baron of the exchequer, was on the relevant commission.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 118. Appointment on April 26, 1397, of the king's brother Edward, earl of Rutland, as justice and warden of the forests south of Trent. Brother means here "nourri," foster-brother, a title constantly given to Rutland, who, of course, was Richard's first cousin.

little band of household troops—an integral part of the establishment of our sovereigns—into a considerable standing force of men-at-arms and archers, with reserves, rapidly mobilisable upon occasion, scattered all over the country. To the efficiency of the king's household troops must be attributed the temporary success of the reign of terror which paralysed all opposition in and out of parliament. Richard's Cheshire bodyguard boasted that the king need fear no man so long as they retained the custody of his person : with their help he could resist all England, and, if need be, the whole world. But even the king's own familiars felt the pride, arrogance and violence of his Cheshire retinue an irksome burden, especially since Richard treated all his servants as of little account, as compared with the soldiers from his principality.¹

To restrictions on freedom, inquisition into opinion, and to subjection to novel or arbitrary jurisdictions, were added exactions more severe and more capricious than those parliamentary taxes which the country had long pronounced intolerable. It was the reckless financial policy of the new government which roused public indignation, much more than the machinery, new or old, employed by the king to establish his autocracy. Despite the liberality of the Shrewsbury parliament, Richard soon felt the pinch of poverty. His impulsive generosity in granting away to his supporters the lands and moveables of his enemies was the more disastrous, because he also lavished large sums on buildings, dress, feasting, tournaments and court entertainments. We need not accept the fantastic figures which some of the chronicles give as to the wastefulness and extravagance of the household ;² but the steady increase of its expenses, as revealed in the wardrobe accounts, show that its cost was beyond that of his magnificent grandfather, and it is certain that by no means all the personal spendings of the court appear in these records.³ Besides constant

¹ *Ann. Ric.* p. 237.

² An example of these is the statement in Hardyng's *Chronicle* (pp. 346, ed. 1812) that ten thousand persons were fed in the king's household, and that there were three hundred servants in his kitchen. Hardyng gives these ridiculous figures on the authority of Richard Ireleffe, clerk of the green cloth. But Hardyng is known to be a liar and a forger, and little attention need be paid to his uncorroborated evidence. Corroboration, however, exists to some extent in the monk of Evesham's statement (p. 148) that, at Christmas, 1398, at Lichfield, " tanta erat ibi cotidie populorum numerus quod omni die expendebantur xxviii vel xxvj boves, et oves quasi ccc : volatile quasi sine numero."

³ See for details below, pp. 208-210.

items of expenditure, others were incurred as a result of the king's anxiety to cut a great figure in the world. At one time, having dreamt of becoming emperor, he expended large sums in an attempt to corrupt the magnates of Germany. Later he became eager to support the eastern empire in its struggle against the Turks, and sent a subsidy to Constantinople as an earnest of more effective future help. The second expedition to Ireland, in 1399, involved another enormous addition to his expenditure.

The result of all this was a long series of demands on his subjects which soon destroyed their faith in Richard. There were constant forced loans. In August and September 1397 more than £15,000 was borrowed from nearly two hundred communities, churches, dignitaries and individuals under promise of return by Easter, while in the course of the autumn and winter over £5000 more was similarly collected.¹ The king's promise of repayment of these sums was seldom kept; later on, a more direct method of exaction seems to have been adopted, by inducing men of substance to bind themselves by obligatory letter to pay certain sums to the king, apparently by instalments, so that arrears could be enforced, under pain of appearance in person before king and council or of arrest and imprisonment. In April 1398 commissions were appointed in Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire to collect nearly £1000 due under such conditions from these two shires.² Nor was this all; for in June, further commissions were instructed to obtain payment of over £1400 due to the king under letters obligatory from Yorkshire alone.³

¹ *Foedera*, viii. 9; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 178-182. The largest individual sums were £1000 from bishop Wykeham of Winchester, and 10,000 marks from the city of London. The gross total from 192 lenders was £20,175. *Ann. Ric.* p. 234, describes the process quite precisely. "(Rex) recepit de quampluribus dominis . . . aliisque personis regni, promittens eisdem bona fide, sub patentibus suis litteris, quod pecunias illas, sic mutuatas, tempore limitato persolveret; quas tamen nunquam postea reddidit creditoribus supradictis." On the above list only one item of 40 marks, lent by the abbot of Woburn, is annotated as "vacated because he was paid." It may be that other letters patent were enrolled elsewhere than in the patent rolls, or not enrolled at all. The latter course was clearly expedient from the king's point of view.

² *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 362-364. The exact sum was £996 : 7 : 0½.

³ *Ib.* p. 368. The exact sum was £1407 : 1 : 2. In each case the commissioners included the sheriffs, the mayor of York and a royal serjeant-at-arms, in most lists John Drax. All the persons "obliged" were private individuals mainly residing in York, Hull and other towns, not always in the shires for which the commission was appointed. *Ann. Ric.* pp. 234-235, also mention the "litterae obligatorie."

The chroniclers' chief complaints are of exactions of which no traces are found in the patent rolls. Richard professed that he dared not travel in the seventeen counties surrounding London because the populace was so devoted to the exiled lords that he was in fear for his life. To provide against this he required those shires to give security for his safety. It took the form of procuring from prominent local persons letters of submission, in which they gave the customary pledge to uphold all the doings of the last parliament and bound themselves by "obligatory letters" to "intolerable fines." These fines were called *Le Plesaunce* because they were offered to the king to obtain his pleasure.¹ It became a regular thing to summon suspected persons before the council "to treat with them" with the proviso that, "if they could not agree with the great council," they should be committed to prison. Agreement involved the payment of an adequate fine. No one was allowed to attend councils assessing these fines, except the three officers of state and the inevitable Bushy, Bagot and Green.² Sometimes the crown compelled suspected individuals to seal blank charters, which were kept under the control of the administration to be filled up at its own caprice.³ By such means the treasury was enabled to equip the second Irish expedition with little waste of time, since all the energies of the king were directed towards impressing ships and sailors, impounding provisions and levying troops.

The result of all this misgovernment was a general feeling of resentment, which spread from the superseded magnates to the mass of substantial citizens, and was the more formidable because the very instruments of Richard's rule were themselves dismayed at the king's lack of coherence and sense of responsibility, and were vexed at the little store he set upon their advice.

Yet no king had ministers more deferential and submissive than Richard. Already, before the culmination of his triumph

¹ *Ann. Ric.* pp. 234-235.

² *A.P.C.* i. 76. Compare above, pp. 11-14.

³ Gregory's *Chronicle*, pp. 100-101. Sir James Ramsay, *Genesis of Lancaster*, ii. 344, pointed out that bundles of these blank charters still exist in the Public Record Office in *T.R. Miscel.* 15/7. This is, in modern P.R.O. classification, *Exchequer, Treasury of Receipt*, E. 34/1; *Privy Seals and Letters Patent for Loans*, but I have failed to find any "blank" charters in it. There are, however, numerous indentures between individuals and royal agents, notably John Drax, covenanting to lend the king money in the fashion described on p. 47, n. 1, above.

in the latter part of 1397, he had established men of his own liking in all the great offices of state and household, and except for a few necessary changes through death and promotion, retained their services until the end of his reign. Thus Edmund Stafford, bishop of Exeter, appointed chancellor on November 23, 1396, remained in office until Thomas Arundel and Henry of Lancaster came back into their own, and never failed to voice the high prerogative doctrines Richard loved. There were three changes in the treasurership during this period. When Roger Walden quitted the exchequer to become archbishop of Canterbury, Guy Mone, already bishop of St. Davids, was rewarded for his long service as both treasurer to the chamber and keeper of the privy seal, by being appointed treasurer on January 22, 1398.¹ Within eight months, on September 17, Mone was replaced by William Scrope, earl of Wiltshire, but he retained Richard's confidence until the end, and was soon recalled to court to serve on the council at a substantial wage.² The earl of Wiltshire, of all the ministers, was perhaps the man most after the king's heart, for he was trusted more than any of the others.³ He consequently stayed in office until he paid with his life the penalty of his devotion to the king. When Mone moved from the privy seal to the treasury, a successor in his former office was found in Richard Clifford, a member of the great Westmorland house. He had been condemned by the appellants in 1388, but had survived to be elevated to the keepership of the great wardrobe in 1390, the appointment being one of the first results of Richard II.'s coming to his own.⁴ Clifford remained keeper of the privy seal for the rest of the reign. ✓

The household officers were just as stable and just as devoted to the king. Thomas Percy and William Scrope, steward and sub-chamberlain respectively since 1393, had a position transcending that of any of their predecessors. Worcester had been

¹ Mone remained receiver until Feb. 1, 1398, and had been keeper of the privy seal until Nov. 18, 1397.

² *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 413, records his appointment on Sept. 25, 1398, "to be one of the king's council for the coming year, receiving such wages as he received for being on the council before he was treasurer." Compare *I.R.* 562/2, which shows that this order was carried out.

³ Scrope's appointment on Sept. 17, 1398, enrolled, curiously enough, in the *Fine Roll* (202/18), was made at Coventry on the very day of the banishment of Hereford and Norfolk.

⁴ See above, iii. 430, 464.

since January 1399 admiral as well as steward,¹ and it looks as if Scrope dovetailed his new treasurership with his old office as vice-chamberlain.² John Carp, now ending his long career, was retained as treasurer of the wardrobe until the end of the reign, but he had under him a very active and rising controller in Sir John Stanley who acted from October 1, 1397, onwards. Stanley now stood to the military side of the household in much the same position as Baldwin Raddington had stood in the earlier part of the reign.³ Richard Clifford was the first man of strong personality who was, during this reign, in charge of the great wardrobe, though he was, as we have seen, soon promoted to be keeper of the privy seal. Among other favourite clerks of the king, John Lincoln continued as king's secretary as long as his master was in power.

Public opinion, voiced in the chronicles and in literature, denounced the ministers of Richard's last years as upstarts raised from obscurity by the king's blind partisanship, the most corrupt, greedy and incompetent of men. An examination of their careers may well lead us to look with suspicion on these statements. Chancellor Stafford was certainly a man of character and energy, an excellent bishop as soon as his release from office gave him opportunity to do his duty to his diocese, and a man of learning whose early academical position left a permanent mark on his character and led to such an increase of the endowments of Stapeldon Hall that he was regarded as the second founder of what was now beginning to be called Exeter College. Richard Clifford also had still before him a distinguished career as statesman and bishop, and even Roger Walden, when no longer in office, was looked upon kindly by those of his enemies, like Thomas Arundel, who knew him best. With a few conspicuous exceptions, the same applies to Richard's lay officials. Few of

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 479. He was made admiral of the fleet for Ireland and admiral of the West and North on Jan. 16 at Coventry.

² It is not clear whether Scrope resigned the vice-chamberlainship when made treasurer. The chronicle in *MS. Cotton, Faustina*, B. ii., closely corresponds with *Ann. Ric. II.*, p. 240, which speak of Wiltshire as still "regis camberlanus." The scantiness of the wardrobe accounts of the period make it hard to find definite record evidence. But it is clear that Scrope was now seldom, if ever, called vice-chamberlain, or, alternatively, chamberlain, in this period. The references in the index of *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, are quite misleading.

³ For details of Raddington and Stanley, see below, pp. 196-200.

them, except Wiltshire and Worcester, enjoyed his intimate confidence, and fewer still, like Wiltshire, remained faithful to him in his day of trouble. Questions of self-interest apart, it looks as if, like Wiltshire's father, Richard Scrope, they had become so disgusted with the king's ways that they were only too glad to be free of his service. Anyhow, such apparent zealots as Stafford and Clifford continued their official career under the new king, and even Walden found early consolation for the loss of Canterbury in his appointment to the bishopric of London. The rise of the house of Stanley, due, in the first place, to Richard's affection for a Cheshire family, was not checked by Richard's fall, and both Sir John and his clerical kinsman, Thomas, keeper of the chancery rolls,¹ attained greater eminence under Henry of Lancaster, while Thomas Percy was among the first to salute the rising sun. It was natural that they should not trust Richard when he trusted them so little.

Richard gave his confidence only to a limited circle of dependents and flatterers. He was jealous of ministers who might become over-mighty, and preferred to rule through humble agents who received but a modest share of the rewards that went to his kinsfolk and aristocratic supporters. He made little parade of acting on his own initiative, and was as glad to quote the advice of the council as he was to appeal to the commissioners, acting "by authority of parliament." The result was a considerable strengthening of the tendency, already clearly apparent, of reducing the king's council to a small bureaucratic body.

Professor Baldwin is well within the mark in saying that the council had never been so obviously a group of experts as in the

¹ I have failed to find the degree of kinship between Thomas and John Stanley. Thomas may have been the Thomas, son of Thomas Stanley of Barlaston, Staffs, mentioned in 1366; *C.P.R.*, 1364-67, p. 323. He was a king's clerk by 1370, and probably already a chancery clerk. His "magister" was John Waltham, afterwards bishop of Salisbury, and up to 1386 he began to "receive attornments by Waltham's license." Before Feb. 5, 1387, but after Nov. 20, 1386, he became a clerk of the first form; *ib.*, 1385-89, pp. 266, 276. He was probably the "Thomas Stanley, priest of the diocese of York," who was admitted papal notary in 1390 (*C. Pap. Reg. Let.*, 1362-1404, p. 361), and the "Mr. Thomas Stanley, priest, of the diocese of Lichfield," made papal chaplain in 1396; *ib.* p. 291. He was made treasurer of Calais in 1395, and was from 1397 to 1399 keeper of the chancery rolls. He helped John of Gaunt to reform the Lancashire chancery, and was, after 1405, chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster. Dean of Wells after 1401, he died on March 11, 1410; Le Neve, i. 151.

last years of Richard's reign.¹ It is unlucky that our record of the acts of the council between 1397 and 1399 is incomplete. The king himself seems seldom to have attended its deliberations, preferring to make his wishes known by intermediaries, such as Mr. William Ferriby, a favourite clerk,² or through Bushy, Green and Bagot. We have seen that, for assessing fines, no other members of the council were permitted to attend, except these three and the three great ministers.³ In the same way, members no longer wanted were ruthlessly excluded, and other persons were made members for restricted purposes only.⁴ Sometimes appeals were sent to the council because intimidation and bribery were feared were they determined by common law.⁵ In later days the strong impetus given by Richard towards a bureaucratic council had its effects, the more so as his supplanter made no scruple of employing the very devices for using which Richard had been deposed.

Thus, a good deal of energy was put into the efforts to make Richard a despot, but the chief stumbling-block, even to momentary success, was the incalculable caprice of the autocrat. The outlook at home was threatening; there were rumours of disturbances in various parts of the country, and stern commissions, sternly executed, could hardly enforce obedience to the law. The very thoroughness with which Richard had completed the break up of the appellants' party by the banishment of Hereford and Norfolk, excited a rebound of sympathy, though the elaborate arrangements for the dignified exile of the two dukes, with a becoming retinue, and the precautions taken to secure adequate representation of their interests in England, showed that the king had been at pains to advertise his generosity. The death of old John of Gaunt, at Leicester in February 1399, encouraged Richard to throw prudence to the winds, and to enrich himself and his friends by treating the Lancaster inheritance as he had treated the estates of Arundel and Warwick. His revocation of the patent allowing

¹ Baldwin, *The King's Council*, p. 142. The whole of the latter part of Mr. Baldwin's chapter on "The King's Council in the time of Richard II." is well worthy of attentive study.

² *A.P.C.* i. 80.

³ See above, p. 48.

⁴ *A.P.C.* i. 175-176 shows an order to stop the fee of Mr. Ralph Selby, baron of the exchequer, because he was no longer on the council, and the appointment of Lawrence Drew as councillor "en cas coursables de la ley et nonpas autrement."

⁵ *Ib.* i. 78.

Henry to receive his inheritance by attorney,¹ his bestowal of Lancaster lands on his favourites, his extension of the term of his cousin's exile, and his systematic transference of the retainers of the old duke and of his son to the royal service,² excited the liveliest sympathy for the banished heir and alarmed the old nobles as to the fate possibly in store for them. Yet this very moment of tension was chosen by the fatuous king as the ripe time for revenging the death of Roger Mortimer and extending his authority over the barons and clansmen of Ireland. The preparations for the expedition gave him new opportunities for oppression and exaction.

Since the death of the earl of March, the duke of Surrey had been justice of Ireland, but he only reached his nominal post shortly before the arrival in Ireland of the king himself. Richard prepared for departure by making his will,³ by going in pilgrimage to seek the protection of St. Thomas of Canterbury, by holding his last Garter Feast at Windsor, and by a touching farewell to his little queen. Last of all, he made arrangements for the government in his absence and in May 1399 made his way slowly through the western shires to Milford Haven, the place of his embarkation. His movements and his following are not so minutely known as on the occasion of his former expedition, because we lack detailed wardrobe accounts. But his methods of ruling and fighting were similar to those adopted in 1394-95. The "yeomen of the crown" were again mobilised by writs addressed to every sheriff,⁴ and the Cheshire archers came in force, for Richard dared not dispense with their protection.⁵ The

¹ *Foedera*, viii. 47-50, gives them in full for both Hereford and Norfolk. Some of Richard's stalwart partisans were included among the attorneys.

² In *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, between pp. 534 and 571, there are more than thirty cases of the confirmation of Lancaster grants to retainers of John and Henry, some of the former going back to Edward III.'s time, because the grantee "is retained to stay with the king only." The grantee generally paid a fine to the hanaper for his patent. The most illustrious grantee was Ralph Neville, the new earl of Westmorland, who paid 100 marks, considerable property being involved. Among the grantees were minstrels, and Henry Green, Leicester herald, sometimes confused with Sir Henry Green; see above, p. 11, n. 3.

³ *Foedera*, viii. 75-77. The long list of executors and legatees suggests his chief intimacies. See also above, pp. 7-8.

⁴ *Ib.* viii. 70. They were to meet in London "coram concilio nostro" on April 2, 1399, the Wednesday in Easter week.

⁵ The "Cestrenses" had followed him even on his pilgrimage to Canterbury, where archbishop Walden had entertained them with lavish hospitality. They came because the king "non bene confidebat in civitate Londoniae nec in comitatu Canciae"; *Cont. Eul. Hist.* iii. 380.

wardrobe accounts show that the organisation of the expedition was on household lines, and that the expense was considerable, though not enormous. The administration of the expedition was centralised as before, either in the great offices of chivalry or in those of the household. Of the former, the duke of Surrey the constable, and the duke of Albemarle the marshal, accompanied the force. Of the latter, there were John, duke of Exeter, the chamberlain, and Thomas, earl of Worcester, steward of the household, and admiral.¹ For more detailed work there were Sir John Stanley, controller of the wardrobe, Sir Richard Witney, harbinger of the household, and John Carp, the veteran treasurer of the wardrobe, all of whom had full burdens imposed upon them.

Nor were military and administrative considerations solely regarded. A band of minstrels, Thomas Prince, the king's painter,² various goldsmiths and other capitalists or artists joined in the miscellaneous train. The whole wardrobe staff went over, and even the privy wardrobe was transferred, with its keeper, from the Tower of London to Ireland. John Lincoln, still king's secretary, with the clerks of the signet, provided the secretariat, through which directions could be sent to the English administration, and the signet, as in 1394-95, was for the time the sole direct instrument of the royal pleasure. Only two earls, besides those already mentioned, were there, and both of them, Gloucester and Salisbury, were of the courtier group. The magnates in attendance were also comparatively few, for Richard's anxiety to have the whole control in his own hands made him jealous of a baron who brought with him a notable retinue.³ On the other hand, court chaplains abounded, and bishops who had risen from this rank, such as Merke of Carlisle, Medford of Salisbury, and Burghill of Lichfield. Even bishop Braybrook of London, the most independent of the group, had once been a court official and was the king's kinsman, while bishop Mone of St. David's was a minister

¹ See above, pp. 6 and 48-49.

² *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 573. "Thomas Litlington, alias Thomas Prince, painter and citizen of London." What was his relationship to the better known Gilbert Prince, painter, who had been in Richard's employment from the early years of his reign? See for him later, p. 391.

³ *Ann. Ric.* p. 238-239: "sed hoc cavit praecepit ne omnes domini . . . multitudinem tantam ducerent bellatorum quae comparari posset suis propriis conductitiis."

of long standing.¹ The youthful Henry Beaufort, bishop of Lincoln, came as a virtual hostage for his brother's good behaviour. Still more frankly hostages were the young sons of the murdered Gloucester and the banished Hereford, the latter the future Henry V.²

The expedition was in a real sense a personal venture of the king. In order to give it a sufficiently imposing appearance, he denuded England of the military force on which he had depended to enforce his commands there, and took with him a large proportion of the kinsmen and councillors by whose advice he was normally guided. Yet, in spite of all, the royal expeditionary force accomplished little or nothing, achieving distinctly less than the previous one. The king's host fought its way with indifferent success, and with many hardships, from Waterford to Dublin, where it had hardly established itself when the grave news from England put an end to all dreams of Irish conquest.

More important for us than the adventures which befell the king is the provision made for the government of England during his absence. This was modelled on the lines traditional since Edward III.'s campaigns in France. As the administration attending on the king centred round the household, so did the home government depend upon the three great offices of state. As usual, the feeble duke of York was appointed nominal keeper of the realm,³ though this mattered the less since Stafford, the chancellor, Wiltshire, the treasurer, and Clifford, keeper of the privy seal, were all left in England with the staff of their respective offices. Moreover, it is clear that the king mainly confided in and relied upon the treasurer, and that Wiltshire's chief associates in controlling policy were the four king's knights, Bushy, Green, Russell and Bagot, the latter having now entirely purged himself

¹ Several of these bishops were or had been Irish officers. Medford had been, since Oct. 23, 1397, treasurer of the Irish Exchequer, but was represented by his clerk until the king's arrival; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 248; Braybrook was, on Oct. 15, 1397, made Irish chancellor, but never acted; *ib.* p. 218.

² The personnel of the expedition can be collected from the letters of protection and attorney recorded in *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 494, 519, 520-525, 536, 541, 551, 553, 559, 575. Some are printed in *Foedera*, viii. 67-68, 78-79. The chroniclers add a few points, and John Creton's French poem on the deposition of Richard II. in *Archaeologia*, xx. 1-423, is particularly instructive.

³ I cannot find the patent or conditions of his appointment; but from this time onwards there is an increasing irregularity in the enrolment of writs which culminates in their suspension in July.

of his association with Norfolk.¹ These formed the active council which gathered round the regent in London, and followed him from place to place.

Soon it became clear that their task was an impossible one, especially as the king had stripped the country of the mercenary bands which alone upheld his autocratic rule. The wildest rumours gained widespread currency, and the administration had no means of checking them or of punishing their disseminators. Men believed that Richard hated England so bitterly that he proposed never to revisit it, but to live as a despot in Ireland and Wales at the expense of his English subjects. Wiltshire was reported to have undertaken to farm all English escheats for three years, and to be trying to increase the profits from them by plotting the death of as many landholders as he dared. The magnates feared lest they should be summoned to the king only to be despoiled of their lives and estates by the judgment of his courtiers.² The bewildered sheriffs began to neglect to summon the shire courts, and the forces of disorder, barely restrained by the presence of the king, were freely let loose when he was no longer in England.

Henry of Lancaster watched from his exile in Paris the situation in England. He still had with him a little retinue, including such faithful followers as Sir Thomas Erpingham and his wise and wealthy esquire, John Norbury. Moreover, since Richard had broken all his promises, Henry naturally felt that he was released from his obligations to keep aloof from Arundel and his other companions in banishment. On Henry's invitation, the dispossessed archbishop made his way to Paris, bringing with him the son of his murdered brother, who had escaped to the continent from the duke of Exeter's brutal custody. Merchants brought the little group of refugees reports of the state of public opinion in

¹ There is no formal evidence of such an appointment of these four, but it is clear from the chronicles that they were the men actually in charge. See, for instance, *Ann. Ric.* p. 243, which ought to be well informed since the regency had its headquarters in St. Albans in the days immediately preceding its flight westwards. The St. Albans writer mentions the chancellor and treasurer and the four "knights of the council" named above, Henry Green being as usual confused by him with his cousin Thomas. He stresses the responsibility of the knights, saying that the chancellor was "*irreprehensibilis et sine querela*." He does not mention Clifford.

² See for all this *Ann. Ric.* pp. 239-240. Too much confidence must not be placed in such prejudiced gossip.

England, and they readily persuaded themselves that the time was come when Henry might return to claim his inheritance. Accordingly they made their way from Paris to Boulogne and embarked upon the few English ships which they found in port, rejecting, it was believed, French help as likely to cool their reception in England. During the last days of June, the little Lancastrian squadron hovered off the Sussex coast, making a temporary landing at the old Fitzalan stronghold of Pevensey, but then sailing northwards, confidently expecting a hearty welcome from the regions where the Lancastrian influence was strong. Early in July it landed on the lower Humber.

The regency was filled with alarm at the news of the Lancastrian invasion, though the magnates in high positions were not unsympathetic to the duke. The fatuous regent declared that he would do nothing to molest his nephew, if he only sought to obtain his lawful inheritance. The chancellor himself seems to have been equally lukewarm. The more militant section, notably Wiltshire and the knights, were all for fighting, but they seem to have feared to remain in the hostile neighbourhood of London. Accordingly, they persuaded the duke of York to remove to St. Albans, where the government had established itself by July 7.¹ From that town, letters patent were issued to the sheriffs, bidding them bring with all speed men-at-arms and archers to defend the realm against invaders, and promising large rewards to those obeying the summons.²

It was, however, too late for effective action. Henry of Lancaster was already in Yorkshire, and had gathered the whole of the north country under his banner. Not only was he welcomed by his own tenants but the greatest families of the north hastened to his support. Foremost among them were the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland and with the former was his son, Henry Hotspur. At the head of a large following, which

¹ *Ann. Ric.* p. 243. Writs sealed at St. Albans between July 7 and 12 (*C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 587, 591) show that the great seal and some chancery clerks followed it thither. The warranting of writs "per ipsum custodem et concilium" shows that the council also betook itself to St. Albans; *Foedera*, viii. 83; *C.C.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 506-507.

² *Ann. Ric.* pp. 243-244. There are no such patents enrolled on *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, but a similar writ was issued at Oxford on July 16 to Roger, archbishop of Canterbury, to raise the Kentish levies and array them on the coast to ward off invaders; *ib.* p. 592. This writ, at least, reached Kent a day after the fair.

mediaeval incuriousness as to statistics described indifferently as a hundred thousand or sixty thousand strong, the banished duke soon moved southwards. Wherever he appeared, he was hailed as a deliverer.

The divided and timid regency urged the king to return at once from Ireland and moved westwards in order to join him. Its progress is marked by the issue of an occasional writ of chancery, but the administrative machine was almost at a standstill, and, after the early days of July, the clerks either ceased to enrol or else to issue writs.¹ Exceptionally a stray writ or two was issued on July 14 from Aylesbury, on July 16-18 from Oxford, and between July 20 and August 5 at Wallingford. In this stronghold of the Cornish duchy, where the household of the queen had been established during Richard's residence in Ireland, the last feeble stand of the regency was made. Already on July 12, Wiltshire, Bushy, Green and Bagot had been appointed keepers of the town with absolute powers.² But the disturbing news soon came that Henry of Lancaster and his forces had changed their course in a westerly direction, and were moving down the Severn valley towards Bristol, hoping to prevent a junction between the regency and the returning king. Scrope, Bushy and Green at once sought safety by a hasty flight to the west, abandoning the regent and his hesitating, half-hearted following.

The appeal for support for king Richard failed. Very few magnates or commons answered the summons to the muster, and of these the only men of mark were the king's knight, Sir William Elmham, and bishop Despenser of Norwich, still as good a fighting bishop as in the days of his Flemish crusade. Scrope, Bushy and Green managed to reach Bristol, where

¹ This is well illustrated by *C.C.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 506-525, where twenty pages, representing five membranes, cover the twenty-third year of Richard II., and still more by *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, where twelve pages (pp. 586-597) are sufficient against the 230 pages required for the roll of 22 Richard II. The twenty-third year nominally extended from June 22 to Sept. 29, 1399. Writs were enrolled, more or less, for the whole of that period. But the whole patent roll of the year needed only nine membranes and of these the dorse was blank of all but three. The thin stream dried up before the end of July, and the later membranes are occupied by writs, issued "teste rege," when Richard had become a puppet in Lancaster's power. There are signs too that the roll, like some of its predecessors, had been altered under Henry IV., so that it represents an attempt to restart the administrative machine after the revolution, rather than a contemporary record of the writs issued. In such circumstances forgetfulness and policy would combine to make the enrolments few.

² *Foedera*, viii. 83.

they received protection from Sir Peter Courtenay, governor of the castle. Meanwhile Edmund of York made his submission to Lancaster at Berkeley, and accompanied him and his army up to the walls of Bristol. His last act as regent was to order Courtenay to surrender the castle, on condition that all its defenders might depart freely, save Wiltshire and the two knights. But news now came that Richard had landed in Wales, and it was therefore not thought safe to keep these three prisoners alive. On July 30 they were beheaded.¹ Thereupon Lancaster retraced his steps in the hope of consolidating his power by the conquest of Cheshire, the inner citadel, as it were, of Richard's kingdom.

While these events were happening, Richard was a prey to the indecision which had paralysed the action of his representatives in England. He had, moreover, to deal with the indiscipline and disloyalty of the chosen followers whom he had taken with him to Ireland. He had trusted no man more than his cousin, Albemarle, his foster-brother, but Albemarle, though constable, had tarried in England after the king's departure, and his late arrival in Ireland had largely contributed to make the campaign against the Irish chiefs an utter failure. When the news of Lancaster's landing reached Ireland, Albemarle, whether from incompetence or treachery, persuaded Richard to divide his army. This bad advice completed Richard's ruin. One part of the army was sent at once, under the earl of Salisbury, from Dublin to North Wales: the bulk, under the king, made its way to Waterford, and finally took ship for Milford Haven, which it reached only after considerable delay.²

Richard landed at Pembroke on July 22.³ He at once

¹ Usk, p. 25, who was present in the retinue of archbishop Arundel, says Bristol was reached "*die antepenultimo Julii*." It surrendered at once and the executions took place the next day. Bagot had escaped on the pretext of going to Ireland, and hid himself in Cheshire, where he was soon captured; Walsingham, ii. 233.

² The story of the division of the army is based solely on Creton; but Creton, unlike the other French chroniclers, was an eye-witness to nearly the whole of the Irish campaign, and accompanied Salisbury to Conway. His story fits in well with the other sources and explains what they leave very mysterious, why the final scenes of Richard's tragedy were in Gwynedd and the Cheshire palatinate, though the king and many of his forces had landed at Milford Haven. Usk, who alone knew the country, gives some measure of corroboration.

³ Usk, p. 27: "*in festo sancte Marie Magdalene*."

dispatched the earl of Gloucester to raise troops among his Glamorgan tenants, but no success attended this effort. The king then resolved to throw himself on the loyalty of his North Welsh and Cheshire followers, under the impression that Salisbury had already raised a force there in his favour. It was clearly impossible for the dispirited host which had accompanied Richard from Ireland to undertake a long journey through difficult country. Accordingly, the king, acting, as a shrewd chronicler believed, on the advice of traitors, resolved to dismiss his army and dissolve his household. The earl of Worcester, as steward, symbolically broke his wand of office and, thereupon, the only administration at Richard's command ceased to exist. The scattered units made their way home as best they could, suffering from hunger, fatigue and the depredations of the Welshmen. Worcester himself promptly followed the example of his brother and nephew and declared for duke Henry.

Richard now made a hasty journey to Carmarthen and thence northwards to Conway, where he hoped to find Salisbury and his troops, reinforced, he believed, by levies from North Wales and Cheshire. But Lancaster showed admirable promptitude in anticipating him. Immediately on the fall of Bristol, the duke hurried northwards, making his way through Hereford, Leominster, Ludlow and Shrewsbury to Chester.¹ Finding fresh adherents at every stage of the journey, he became too strong for even Cheshire to resist him. Chester and its castle opened their gates, and three days later Henry set a stern example by beheading one of the greatest of the lawless Cheshire squires, on whose stubbornness Richard's last hopes reposed.²

Salisbury had now been for some time at Conway, but the Welsh whom he had called to his standards, tired of waiting in vain for the king's arrival, had gone home, and Salisbury's own force was too small to give the king effective support. After some uneasy wanderings from castle to castle in Gwynedd, Richard went back to Conway and sent Exeter and Surrey to Chester to make what terms they could. His surrender to Lancaster followed on August 19 at Flint, and with it his reign came

¹ Usk, who accompanied him, gives his itinerary. Aug. 2, Hereford; Aug. 3, Leominster; Aug. 4, Ludlow; Aug. 5-6, Shrewsbury; Aug. 9-21, Chester.

² This was Perkin Legh of Lyme. Usk, p. 27, says he was "magnus malefactor reputatus."

to an ignominious end. Richard's last act of sovereignty, the bestowal of his signet ring on Lancaster, is significant of his exalted views of its functions. Treated still with outward respect, Richard was at once taken to Chester, and henceforth was but a puppet in the hands of his conqueror.

By this time, the administration in England, following the regent's example, had gone over bodily to Henry of Lancaster. The great seal and some of the chancery clerks were already at Chester, so that the wishes of the new government could be embodied in official writs. On August 19 a new parliament was summoned to meet at Westminster on September 20.¹ On August 20 letters close were sent out to all the sheriffs, announcing, in Richard's name, that his dearest kinsman, Henry, duke of Lancaster, had come to England to redress the defects in its government and that the king, unwilling to endure any longer the evils from which the realm had suffered, had, with the advice of his cousin, of Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, of the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland and of the other magnates, ordered them to make proclamation of his peace, to put down all disturbances, and to offer to all aggrieved persons the redress afforded by the common law.² Next day, Richard began his melancholy progress to London, accompanied by his captor and all his array. At Lichfield he made an unsuccessful attempt to escape, and the last blow on his behalf was struck by some Welsh partisans, who vainly strove to break up the Lancastrian army between Lichfield and Coventry. On September 1, London was reached, and Richard lodged in the Tower.

Each stage of the journey was punctuated by writs issued by the king, "with the assent of the duke of Lancaster," a formula alternating, after the arrival in London, with "by the advice of the duke of Lancaster and with the assent of the council." In the course of September, the machine of state was again brought into working order by such fictitious devices. For instance, on September 3, Richard was made to appoint John Norbury, Lancaster's esquire, to the treasurership left vacant by Wiltshire's execution.³ On September 5, he was

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 520-521.

² *Foedera*, viii. 84; *C.C.R.*, 1396-99, p. 522. The writs are of the normal type: "teste rege apud Cestriam. Per ipsum regem."

³ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 595.

similarly forced to supersede Stafford as chancellor by John Scarle, a belated instance of a clerk of the office promoted to its headship. In September 1397, Scarle had been superseded as keeper of the rolls in favour of Thomas Stanley, a former treasurer of Calais. But though not disgraced, this old servant of John of Gaunt¹ was, doubtless, like his supplanter, in keen sympathy with the Lancastrian revolution, which both promptly accepted. Lancaster was no longer content with restoration to his duchy; he now desired the throne. By dexterous legal subtleties this was secured for him both by Richard's resignation, signed "with his own hand," on September 29, and by deposition in parliament. When the estates met on September 30, Henry at once "challenged the throne" and took possession of it. Fresh writs in the new king's name enabled the parliament to go on as a new one and accept the lengthy articles drawn up against the baffled despot. There was no question of a trial, since Richard's resignation let judgment go by default.

The fall of Richard was the more complete and tragic because he had at no time been able to put up an effective resistance. The Cheshire archers and the yeomen of the white hart had melted away without striking a blow in his favour. The favourites and kinsmen, whom Richard had bribed so lavishly, made haste to make their peace with his supplinters. As far as the administration was concerned, there was less disturbance of the existing order than when Richard had come to his throne. The majority of the king's ministers accepted, with promptness and apparent cordiality, the accession of Henry IV. Edmund Stafford yielded up the chancery, but did not refuse a place in the king's council, and, a few months later, again received the custody of the seal. Richard Clifford was declared loyal, was, at the request of parliament, pardoned for his offences in 1386-87, and continued in possession of the privy seal until, two years later, he

¹ Scarle accounted (by deputy) up to Sept. 11, 1397: see above, iii. 450, n. 1. In 1382 Scarle had, like Haydock and Thelwall, been allowed to combine his clerkship in the king's chancery with the chancellorship of the duchy of Lancaster; *Duchy of Lancaster Misc. Books*, xiv. ff. 65d-66. A little before this, Stanley was sent with his clerks to Lancaster "et illeogues demorent et occupant l'office de nostre chancellerie"; *ib.* f. 65. It looks as if, on Thelwall's return to the king's chancery, Stanley, and a group of king's chancery clerks, were sent to Lancaster to put the duchy chancery in order. The incident explains why Stanley, as well as Scarle, was kept on after 1399 by Henry IV.

obtained his bishopric. In spite of the close association of the judges with Richard's misdeeds, the same generosity was shown to the two benches. The five existing justices of the common bench and the three justices of the king's bench were all re-appointed. The exchequer too enjoyed the same consideration, for of the five barons two only were new and one of them had been a king's clerk under Richard.

When the principals were thus continued, it was only natural that the permanent staffs under their control should also go on. Thus, in the chancery Thomas Stanley remained keeper of the rolls, and for the next few years his successors, Nicholas Bubwith, John Wakering and Simon Gaunstede, were all chosen from the chancery clerks of the first form under Richard II.¹ Long lists of "ratifications of the estate" of king's clerks in their livings and prebends fill the early membranes of Henry IV.'s first patent roll, and show his anxiety to recognise the vested interests of the smaller officers. Even the household offices were not completely restaffed, though here room had to be found for the servants of the new king who had ministered to him faithfully since his crusading days. Particular care was taken to provide for such of Richard's servants as were willing to accept the new order. Sir John Stanley, for example, Richard's controller of the household, was soon appointed justice of Ireland, and within six years was back again in the household as its steward.²

Even the magnates, who had submitted to Henry at almost the last moment, had their positions respected. The earls of Westmorland and Northumberland were rewarded with the offices of marshal and constable for their early secession from Richard,³ while Hotspur succeeded Wiltshire as justice of North Wales and Chester.⁴ The earl of Worcester was nominated admiral of the north and west⁵ as some compensation for his lost stewardship. Before long he was appointed vice-steward

¹ One of the few changes in the chancery was the replacement of William Waltham as keeper of the hanaper by Robert Claydon on Oct. 1, 1399; *Hanaper Accounts* in *L.T.R. For. Accts.* No. 33 f. B. The hanaper receipts since 1397 had been largely swollen through fines and the exceptional number of "charters of small seal" issued—no less than 4206 in 21 Ric. II. The hanaper profits were £2823 in 20 Ric. II., £5261 in 21 Ric. II., and £3107 in 22 Ric. II.; *ib.* nos. 31 B, 32 A and 33 B.

² *C.P.R.*, 1401-5, p. 492.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1399-1401, p. 37.

³ *Foedera*, viii. 89, 115.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 95.

of England under the king's younger son, Thomas, and in that position, superior in dignity and in power to his old one, he was still enabled to take an active part in household affairs.¹

The revolution of 1399 was accompanied by little bloodshed or violence. Wiltshire, Bushy and Green were its only victims, and the punishment meted out to other Ricardian partisans was exceedingly light. The most severe penal measures were the degradation of Albemarle, Surrey and Exeter from their duchies to their former earldoms, and the reduction of the marquis of Dorset and the earl of Gloucester to their former rank of earl and baron. But Sir William Bagot and the earl of Salisbury were soon released from prison,² while the clerical offenders were treated with extreme leniency. Roger Walden lost the primacy, but his life was spared at Arundel's request, and he was, after a decent interval, made bishop of London. Bishop Merke of Carlisle lost his bishopric by a sham translation, and ended his career, as he had begun it, as a monk of Westminster. Further punishments only came when the degraded dukes burst into open revolt within a few months of their pardon. They atoned for their treachery on the scaffold, and the direct result of their folly was the murder of the deposed king, in whose favour they had risen. On the whole, Henry's own followers might well have complained that the king's wish to win over his old enemies gave them scanty chances of the promotion which they not unreasonably expected. We must not carry on the story beyond this point, but some account of the appointments attending the change of dynasty seemed necessary, if only to show how little the political revolution involved a real breach of administrative continuity or personnel.

It has been the fashion to regard the revolution of 1399 as a landmark in constitutional history. It has been supposed to have involved the triumph of the estates over the monarchy, and the establishment of a new dynasty owing its throne to parliament and therefore dependent on it. It has even been

¹ This statement is based on the numerous commissions in which he is associated with the treasurer and controller for the regulation of household affairs. He is sometimes even called steward of the household; *C.P.R.*, 1399-1401, pp. 445, 475, 490, 504, 536, 545.

² Bagot's final release was not until Nov. 12, 1400; *C.C.R.*, 1399-1402, p. 224.

regarded as a turning-point in religious history, because it has been imagined to have brought about the restoration of orthodoxy and the final overthrow of Lollardy. There may be a good deal in the former opinion, and the latter contention, though more disputable, can perhaps be argued. To the administrative historian the moral of the fall of Richard II. is more restricted and more negative. If it proves anything at all, it is that administrative history presents a continuity which is broken neither by reaction nor by revolution.

Richard, when claiming his indefeasible monarchy by divine right, used the same administrative machinery which had been handed down to him from the days of the minority, and, beyond that, from the great days of Edward III. Neither conservatives nor radicals had any policy of institutional change. They accepted what they found ready to their hands, and all that they tried to do was to give greater efficiency to the established instruments of government. There was no longer even that struggle between the officers of the household and the officers of the state which, in earlier times, had given the eternal strife between the monarchy and the aristocracy the appearance of a battle between rival forms of administration. The household posts had been nationalised by an extension of the process which had, ages before, turned chancery and exchequer from offices of the court into offices of the nation. Both groups were being combined into a single disciplined service of the state, which, notwithstanding the increasing diversity in its sections, was becoming, more and more clearly, a unity. The point at issue was only whether this machine of state was to be controlled by the king or by the nobles. The conflict swayed from side to side, from generation to generation, and almost from year to year. Sometimes the one, sometimes the other seemed to gain the upper hand, but neither party could maintain power for long. When a weak king gave the magnates their chance, the aristocratic triumph was at once followed by the splitting up of the victors into rancorous factions, whose feuds gave the monarch the opportunity to get back his own. When the king obtained control, the aristocracy reformed its ranks and soon checked any excesses of his authority. The commons might sometimes be manipulated by a skilful king to serve his purpose as a weapon

against the nobles, but more normally their mission was to follow the lead of the magnates in resisting the encroachments of the crown. There was generally no great difference of political programme between the two sides. It was enough to get possession of the machine of state, to staff it with partisans, and to use it to secure a continuance of power.

The permanent officials, who, after all, did the work, were quite content to follow the lead of their masters, and when the headquarters staff was thus amenable, little independence was to be anticipated from the local authorities. Yet, however much reformers, like Richard II., strove to bring them to heel, they remained in the long run obstinately representative of local opinion, merely broadening the ancient tradition of aristocratic control by bringing the smaller country gentry into local administration and politics. Perhaps one of the most important results of fourteenth century administrative development was this extension of the governing class from a limited ring of great tenants to the wider circle of the lesser landholders, who, both in central parliaments and in local offices, were sometimes able to say the decisive word in the struggles between the crown and the magnates. The larger the governing class, the more conservative was its outlook. Its cry was always for a restoration of the good old ways which had prevailed in a highly idealised or purely imaginary golden past. The most radical proposals made by it were for practical reform in details; the crown and the bureaucracy were left to devise more original innovations. Under Richard II., as under Edward II., the radicals were generally the king and his favourites, seldom the greater magnates, never the commons of the boroughs or shires. Now that the administrative system had consolidated itself, there was little desire on any side to subject it to fundamental change.

Whatever party was in control, the weakness of the executive was the chief difficulty. There were constant efforts to enforce the laws, but little sustained capacity to impose their execution on an unwilling people. Thus, the standard of public order remained low, and no government had power to remedy the chronic disorder. All parties accepted, as part of the order of nature, an administrative anarchy which modern society would find intolerable. There were no decisive victories, for the pendulum swayed

now in one direction and now in another, but never permanently inclined to any one side. Richard II.'s bold bid for despotism was the greatest attempt to readjust the political balance, and its immediate and sorry collapse suggested that no far-reaching measures of change were likely to be successful.

Perhaps the Lancastrian revolution did save parliament and the constitution. Yet there was no clear-cut distinction between the monarchical policy of the fifteenth and that of the fourteenth century. Henry IV. ruled by the same machinery and through the same persons as Richard II. The only difference was that the weakness of Henry's position made impossible any aggressions of the sort Richard had loved. Henry V. was much more powerful than Henry IV., at least as strong a ruler as Edward III., and never committed Richard's cardinal mistake of setting himself up against aristocratic opinion. He was, like Edward III. in his best days, lucky in being able to lead his nobles in a popular foreign war, instead of disputing with them the control of the government of England. After his premature death, the aristocratic element grew in force and was responsible in the end for the Wars of the Roses.

The administrative history of the fifteenth century has still to be written, but it is doubtful whether it will disclose tendencies different from those which we have endeavoured to study in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The balance between monarchy and aristocracy was still maintained, though conditions became all in favour of the ultimate supremacy of the latter. The weakening of the crown meant a decline in public order. The immense growth of material civilisation, wealth, prosperity and comfort, cried aloud for a more orderly state of society than that bequeathed by the Middle Ages. When the remedy was found in that strengthening of the crown which began with Edward IV. and was consummated by the Tudors, the "new monarchy" involved no startling new departures. Its devices for improving central control and establishing public order were all borrowed from the armoury of the Plantagenets. Some readjustment was the more necessary because the great instruments of the mediaeval state were stiffening into decrepitude. The chancery was becoming a law court; the exchequer was fossilised by tradition; the privy seal had degenerated

into an unnecessary addition to formalism ; the ancient household offices had lost their elasticity and had become more domestic than public in their scope. On the other hand, the secretary and his signet were growing in authority and importance, and were becoming the new pivot of the administrative system. The chamber was reconstituted as a vital and living financial control and was ultimately to be brought into organic relation with the exchequer. The local system, as ordered in the days of the Edwards, was left intact but considerably strengthened. The justices of the peace and the sheriffs remained roughly representative of the lesser aristocracy, and it was they, and not a bureaucracy regulated from the centre, who controlled the daily lives of the average Englishmen. From fear of the overmighty subject, they were inclined to lean on the crown rather than on the local magnate. The concentration of aristocratic power into the hands of a limited circle of surviving nobility, together with weakening of its independence and initiative, inevitably strengthened the royal power and made the monarchy the only source of law and order. Thus, the policy which Richard II. had attempted, prematurely and without prudence or intelligence, at last became practicable. The crown led the commons in a victorious struggle against the old aristocracy and strengthened itself by alliance with the new nobility, which, like the new hierarchy of the Reformation, owed its existence to the crown. Into this process it is not our business to enter, but we may hazard the guess that, when the administrative history of the Tudors has been examined in detail, its lesson will not be very different from the moral of that of the history of the Plantagenets. It will again illustrate the extraordinary continuity of English administrative institutions and their remarkable independence of the political and constitutional vicissitudes of the English state.

CHAPTER XI

THE WARDROBE OF THE HOUSEHOLD UNDER EDWARD III

WE have seen that when Edward of Carnarvon ascended the throne, the servants of the prince became the chief ministers of the king, and carried through the changes in policy which followed his accession. The early age at which Edward of Windsor assumed the royal title, and his strict tutelage under his mother for the next three years, prevented his pre-regnal household playing an equally prominent part when he took over the reins of government. Moreover, until the eve of his accession, the youthful prince was invested with no greater dignity than the earldom of Chester, and although considerations of policy raised him at last to the duchy of Aquitaine, he was never appointed prince of Wales.¹ Naturally, therefore, his household was smaller and more localised than that of his father when prince. Its members were less intimately associated with him, and less able to influence his future policy. Yet even in these conditions we can trace continuity of tradition, and discern in the servants of the infant earl important factors in determining his policy as king.

The beginnings of Edward of Windsor's household establishment were sufficiently modest. Created earl of Chester on November 24, 1312,² eleven days after his birth, his seal as earl was sent to his Cheshire chancery when he was a year

¹ Nevertheless, his household was, from an early date, largely supported by drafts on the revenue of Wales. See, for instance, *C.C.R.*, 1313-18, p. 11, a mandate to send £20 to Bisham to the keeper of the king's son's wardrobe for his expenses.

² *C.Ch.R.* iii. 202. The grant was of the lands, but involved the title. He was described as "earl of Chester" soon afterwards; *C.P.R.*, 1313-17, p. 190.

old,¹ and he was summoned to parliament, as earl, when a boy of only eight.² Though his financial resources came mainly from his earldom, the household constituted for him in his babyhood was quite independent of the local government of Cheshire. A glimpse of his household at its earliest stage is given in a wardrobe account of his pre-regnal years, which seems to have been the only one preserved. This is a roll of expenses of the *hospicium* between January 26 and July 6, 1313, which shows the baby earl moving from Bray to Bisham at the beginning of the period, and apparently stationary there for the rest of the time of the account.³ It is a *jornale*, recording expenses under the heads of the different offices,⁴ day by day, and giving summaries, week by week.

The gross expenditure in cash and commodities is high, considering the boy's tender age, and the quantity of wine and wax consumed suggests that the household was not small. For one-sixth of the period the child was at court with his parents, and his establishment charges were transferred to the expenses of the king's household, so that to that extent the real cost of his maintenance was larger than the sum represented in his accounts. On the other hand, when queen Isabella stayed with her son for four days, she paid the whole of his expenses for that time, though Edward II.'s only recorded visit, a doubtful coming to

¹ Brown, p. 80.

² *Parl. Writs* II. (ii.) 219, on Aug. 5, 1320, for a parliament, meeting on Oct. 6.

³ *E.A.* 375/3. There is some inaccuracy in the reckonings, but an annexed memorandum corrects it. The entries began at Bray, and the household removed to Bisham next day. For the latter part of the account the days recorded are correct. Some of the margins are so torn that it is possible there were movements of the household of which record is lost.

⁴ The headings are "dispensaria, butillaria, coquina, scutillaria, salsaria, aula et camera, stabulum, vadia." The expenses under these categories are in cash, but the quantities of wine and wax are also recorded. The memorandum referred to above is worth quoting in full: "Memorandum quod a die Veneris, xxvj^o Januarii, anno regis sexto, usque sextum Julii, anno eodem finiente, id est per clxij dies, exceptis xxvij^{is} diebus per quos dictus dominus cum familia sua fuit in curia et ad sumptus domini regis, in omnibus expendebantur in hospicio predicto, ut patet infra per presentem rotulum, ut sequitur, uno die per medium alterius computato, viz: in denariis, iij *li.* vj *s.* viij *d.*; in vino xvj sext.; in cera xv lib." This attempt to average each day's expenses is noteworthy from its rarity. The sums of expenses are "summa denariorum," £585 : 14 : 1; "summa vini," 2205 "sextarii," 3 "picherii"; "summa cere," 1932 lbs.

a meal, is mentioned as causing an increase in the earl's expenses.¹

The earl's wardrobe and household were of the normal type, and the chief officers were the keeper or treasurer, the steward and the cofferer. Of the latter two officers, we know that Thomas of Folkardby was cofferer in 1313,² and that the stewards were John Sapy, knight in 1314,³ Robert Mauley, knight from 1314 to 1320,⁴ and John de Claroun, a foreigner, and apparently a *franc comtois* in 1324.⁵ The succession of keepers is clearer. First came Hugh of Leominster, clerk, who, before Edward II.'s accession, had been chamberlain of Carnarvon.⁶ He acted as treasurer from the beginning in 1313 to 1316 at least.⁷ Then followed Nicholas Huggate, who had previously been a clerk of Edward II. when prince of Wales.⁸ He was, apparently, one of the numerous Yorkshiremen brought by archbishop Melton into the king's service, and had been cofferer of Edward II.'s wardrobe between 1314 and 1315.⁹ Huggate was already acting as keeper in January 1319,¹⁰ and seems after that to have been

¹ On the margin of the account in *E.A.* 375/3 for Feb. 13, is the note: "Isto die Martis credebatur regem venisse ad prandium." This was put to explain an increase of expenses for the week, which came to £37 : 18 : 7 in all. Under Monday, May 7, is the note, "pro adventu domine regine, quia ad sumptus eiusdem. Eadem nocte dominus et familia fuerunt ad sumptus domine regine iiij diebus sequentibus." This visit is recorded to explain that there were no expenses for these days, consequently the whole week only cost £10 : 6 : 6. Again under Tuesday, June 12, is the record that the king's step-mother, Margaret of France, came to see her husband's grandson, "Isto die fuit domina Margareta, regina Anglie, ad prandium." Professor Johnstone notes that Eleanor of Castile did not visit her son Henry, when he lay dying, only thirty miles away; *B.J.R.L.* vii. 397.

² *C.C.R.*, 1307-12, p. 537.

³ Acting on July 26, 1314; *ib.*, 1313-18, p. 191.

⁴ Acting before July 1314 (*E.A.* 376/7, m. 75 d.) and also on Nov. 2, 1317 (*C.P.R.*, 1317-21, p. 42), Jan. 16-Mar. 6, 1319 (*C.F.R.* ii. 389, 392), and May 1-June 5, 1320, *C.P.R.*, 1317-21, pp. 453-454.

⁵ *Ib.*, 1324-27, p. 39, shows him acting on Oct. 30, 1324. Edward's nurse in 1314 was Margaret, wife of Stephen Chandler; *C.F.R.* ii. 189.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1292-1301, p. 502; *C.F.R.* i. 427.

⁷ He was acting as keeper at least between June 24, 1313 (*C.C.R.*, 1307-13, p. 3) and July 22, 1316 (Brown, p. 88).

⁸ See above, ii. 171.

⁹ He acted from Sept. 29, 1314, to at least Sept. 28, 1315 (*E.A.* 376/7), but was "nuper coffrarius" on Oct. 31, 1315. His successor, Henry Hale, was already cofferer on Jan. 1, 1316; *C.C.R.*, 1313-18, p. 548. I omitted Hale from my list of the cofferers of Edward II. in the *Place of Edward II.* p. 356. He was out of office before April 12, 1317, when Wodehouse succeeded him.

¹⁰ *C.F.R.* iii. 8.

permanently attached to the earl's service as a chief minister, until after the earl became king. We find him in office as keeper until 1321, and it looks as if he retained that post until his successor was appointed in June 1323.¹ For the rest of Edward II.'s reign we shall see that he served Edward in Aquitaine.²

The next keeper was William of Cusance, whom we have known already as a clerk of the Despensers, and afterwards as keeper of Edward II.'s great wardrobe from 1320-21.³ He came from the free county of Burgundy, and many members of his family established themselves in England, some in Cluniac monasteries, others in Edward of Windsor's household.⁴ When, after the breach with France in 1324, orders were issued that all subjects of the French crown should be seized and their goods confiscated, Cusance and his kinsfolk were specially exempted, because they were "not born of the power of the king of France."⁵

Edward of Windsor's estate was gradually amplified. The original grants of 1312 included besides Cheshire, Carisbrooke and the king's lands in the Isle of Wight.⁶ To these were added the honour of Wallingford in 1314,⁷ the Channel Islands in 1319,⁸ and numerous other lands.⁹ Though allowing his son some

¹ Huggate was certainly acting as keeper up to the end of 1320; Brown, p. 94. I feel sure he continued until the appointment of Cusance on June 23, 1323; *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, pp. 552-553.

² See later, pp. 73-74.

³ See above, ii. 272; and *Pl. of Edw. II.* pp. 136 and 357. For his later career see iii. 161, and iv. 106-110 and 122-130.

⁴ Cusance is a village, ar. Baume-les-Dames, dep. Doubs. Among the other members of the clan in England were William's brothers, Peter and James, the latter prior of Prittlewell, and a third brother, John, prior of Bermondsey. He had an uncle, Gerard, and a nephew, William, later a knight and lord of Down Ampney, Glouc., who was the son of Peter and born in England. He died on Dec. 5, 1342. See for the above, *C.P.R.*, 1324-27, pp. 30, 39-41, and *Cal. Inq.* viii. No. 601. It seems possible that the steward Claroun was a member of the same family.

⁵ The chancery clerks were not well informed in Burgundian geography, for on Sept. 30, 1324, they exempted the Cusances in the belief that they were French subjects. By Oct. 30 they had ascertained that the Free County was not in France.

⁶ *C.Ch.R.* iii. 202-203. He is sometimes described as lord of Wight as well as earl of Chester; *C.P.R.*, 1317-21, p. 546.

⁷ *C.C.R.*, 1313-18, p. 64.

⁸ *C.Ch.R.* iii. 407-408. Along with these went the lands in Ireland held for life by Otho Grandison.

⁹ For instance, the High Peak, certain Welsh lands and portions of Cheshire, hitherto reserved, and now assigned to Edward for the sustenance of his brother and sister, in Jan. 1319; *C.F.R.* ii. 389. These lands had previously been granted to the two children directly; *C.P.R.*, 1317-21, p. 222. In 1320 they

lands in Wales,¹ Edward II. carefully kept the principality in his own hands. Only after the homage question with France had become insistent, did policy suggest the transference to the little earl of the king's dominions in France, the duchy of Aquitaine and the county of Ponthieu.² One result of his extension of interest to Aquitaine was the division of his household into an insular and a continental department.

William Cusance was retained in England as keeper of the wardrobe, and did not give up this position even when, after January 10, 1326, he was also appointed keeper of Edward's lands and castles and receiver of his issues in England during his absence abroad.³ He remained keeper of Edward's English estates until his master's return. As an old dependent of the Despensers, he seems to have been roughly handled during the revolution in 1326. Accordingly, it was found necessary to excuse him from accounting, on the ground that his books were lost during the troubles at London.⁴

Huggate was destined to play in Aquitaine the part which Cusance was fulfilling in the earl's English estates. On March 1, 1324, he was appointed receiver of all monies and victuals to be sent to Aquitaine,⁵ and in September had letters of protection as about to proceed to that duchy.⁶ As early as June 1324, he had been hard at work raising in England an army for Gascony,⁷ and he was at Bordeaux by April 1, 1325.⁸ When, immediately after his appointment as duke, Edward joined his mother in France, Huggate's position seems to have been further strengthened. On October 17, 1325, he received protection for a year because he was staying beyond seas in the king's service.⁹ He

were restored to Queen Isabella (*ib.* p. 453) for the expenses of John and Eleanor, who thus seem to have been brought under their mother's charge.

¹ They are enumerated in the grant of Jan. 1319 mentioned in n. 9, above, p. 72.

² *Foedera*, ii. 607-608. The grant was made in Sept. 1325.

³ *C.F.R.* iii. 372. He was, for instance, still "the earl's treasurer" in the "chamberlain's claims," between Sept. 1325 and Dec. 1326; Brown, p. 97. Chester, Beeston, Flint and Rhuddlan castles were excepted from the grant to Cusance because they were in the jurisdiction of the justice of Chester. Edward had already crossed the Channel on Sept. 12, 1325.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 522; *ib.*, 1334-38, p. 41.

⁵ *C.F.R.* iii. 258-259.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1324-27, p. 26.

⁷ *C.C.R.*, 1323-27, p. 123-124; *C.P.R.*, 1321-24, p. 430.

⁸ *C.F.R.* iii. 341.

⁹ *C.P.R.*, 1324-27, p. 181.

is later described as keeper of the duke's wardrobe in Aquitaine¹ and his old functions as receiver, along with the office of constable of Bordeaux, were discharged from February 19 to April 16, 1326, by Richard of Bury.² Nevertheless Huggate seems to have returned to England before his master and the queen,³ and to have been succeeded in his charge abroad by the outgoing constable of Bordeaux, the exchequer clerk, Adam Limber.⁴ When the queen and her son returned to England as conquerors, Huggate became controller of their joint wardrobe, and was, as we shall see, continued as controller when Edward became king. The indulgence allowed to Cusance as regards his accounts was also extended to Huggate.⁵

The officers of Edward of Windsor's wardrobe, assisted by his council, had the usual duty of controlling the local administration of his lands and of auditing the officers' accounts.⁶ These accounts were complicated as other members of the royal family were added to, or withdrawn from, the household of the earl. Up to 1319, John of Eltham, the earl's younger brother, and Eleanor, his sister, were staying in his household at his expense. To relieve the burden thus caused, additional lands were granted to

¹ *I.R.* 243/4 (3 Edw. III. Easter): "nuper custos garderober domini regis Anglie et ducis Aquitanie in partibus dicti ducatus." Compare *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 368, which describes Huggate as acting successively as receiver in Gascony and keeper of the wardrobe. Compare *ib.* p. 272, where "treasurer" should read "treasurer of duke's household."

² We know this from a writ of Dec. 30, 1332, which excuses Bury from accounting for the months when he was constable and receiver of Bordeaux; *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 383.

³ This is an inference from *C.F.R.* iii. 397, an order of July 9, 1326, to Huggate as late receiver, to deliver certain wine to be carried to the king's butler in London.

⁴ This is the only way I can explain an order of Mar. 6, 1333 (*C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 20), which describes Roger Waltham, Nicholas Huggate and Adam Limber as successive keepers of the wardrobe of Edward III. and his father. I looked up the passage in *C.R.* 153/21, and found that the calendar accurately represents the text, but the convincing evidence of the accounts makes it certain that Wodehouse went on continuously into the new reign, and was immediately succeeded by Bury. The alternative hypothesis is that a chancery clerk made a mistake. Limber was never keeper of Edward III.'s wardrobe as king, but he was, between 1322 and 1325, constable of Bordeaux (*Pl. of Edw. II.* p. 397), so that he may well have succeeded Huggate as keeper of the duke's wardrobe beyond sea.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 368.

⁶ For instance, the bailiff of Carisbrooke rendered his accounts to Thomas Cambridge and Huggate; *ib.*, 1324-27, p. 23. In 1318 Huggate was one of those appointed to inquire into extortions of the earl's ministers; *ib.*, 1317-21, p. 134.

him. These were transferred to queen Isabella in 1320 when she took charge of the children.¹ Finally, John of Eltham was given a separate household of his own,² while Eleanor and her baby sister Joan were, even before their mother's departure to France, entrusted to the custody of Isabella Hastings.³

The administrative arrangements for the new reign illustrate the large extent to which administrative continuity rose superior to political revolution. When the success of the invasion of Isabella and Mortimer was assured, and the young duke of Aquitaine was made keeper of the realm, a joint wardrobe for the queen and her son was constituted.⁴ After January 24, 1327, this became, under the same officers, the normal king's wardrobe of Edward III., and Isabella had once more an establishment of her own. In both the joint and the independent wardrobe of the new ruler, the highest place of treasurer was continued to the veteran Robert Wodehouse, who remained in office until August 20, 1328.⁵ It was easy for this official to accept accomplished facts, and he was, for the rest of his career, as loyal to the son as he had once been to the father. Some new blood was thought desirable, and room was found for a few of Edward's servants as duke. Huggate's "manifold services" to Edward "since his boyhood" were rewarded by his being made, first controller for the duke, and then for the king. He was, however, too busy to discharge this work personally to begin with,⁶ being employed in directing, at York, the arrangements for the young king's marriage.⁷ He remained controller for eighteen months, but made

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1317-21, pp. 453-454; *C.F.R.* iii. 6. The chief of these were Macclesfield and Overton, former dower lands of queen Eleanor, and doing the same duty now for Isabella. They were only in Edward's hands when he had custody of his brother and sister, and went back to Isabella in 1320.

² John had a household of his own by 19 Edw. II., the expenses of which are recorded in *E.A.* 381/12. Its keeper was William de Culpho, *Pipe* 171/8, 19 Edw. II. At one stage John was under the care of Eleanor Despenser; *E.A.* 382/12. His household was renewed from Dec. 13, 1326; *C.C.R.*, 1323-27, p. 621. She was paid from the issues of the queen's lands when they were sequestrated.

³ *Ib.*, 1323-27, p. 260.

⁴ *I.R.* 222 describes Wodehouse up to the New Year as "custos garderobe Edwardi filii regis primogeniti, ipso rege extra regnum agente," and John Oxenden as "custos garderobe Isabelle regine Anglie consortis domini regis" on Jan. 10.

⁵ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/27.

⁶ John Brunham accounted as his lieutenant for the coronation expenses; *E.A.* 383/8.

⁷ *I.R.* 232/9-10.

little further mark on the history of his time, and died within five years of leaving office.¹

Wodehouse's career was hardly broken. In 1329 he took up again the post of baron of the exchequer which he had held between 1318 and 1323.² He remained closely attached to the exchequer as baron, chancellor and twice treasurer,³ thus affording one more illustration of the normal promotion of a meritorious official from the wardrobe to the exchequer.

Wodehouse's two successors as keeper were men of different type. The first, Richard Bury, keeper from August 21, 1328,⁴ to September 23, 1329, continued the representation of the personal ducal household which Huggate's retirement would otherwise have ended. Bury's keepership was but an incident in a career of steady advancement, and his confidential relations to his master were strengthened by a promotion which, at any earlier time, would have seemed degradation, namely that from the keepership of the wardrobe to the keepership of the privy seal. The second, Master Thomas Garton, was a Yorkshireman, who had already been controller since June 11, 1328, when Huggate retired. He acted as keeper from September 24, 1329, to October 16, 1331. A wardrobe clerk of Edward II. since 1319, acting as

¹ On Feb. 4, 1333, he received license to acquire land for a chantry of six chaplains, but died before he accomplished his purpose; and the license was transferred to his executors; *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, pp. 171-173.

² See *Pl. of Edw. II.* p. 343.

³ Wodehouse was appointed second baron of the exchequer on Apr. 16, 1329; *C.P.R.*, 1327-30, p. 383. Dr. Broome thinks that he never acted, as his name does not occur in the issue rolls in this connection, and his predecessor, Robert Nottingham, continued to receive salary as baron. Anyhow, Wodehouse was made treasurer of the exchequer on Sept. 16, 1329, and held office till Nov. 30, 1330. On Dec. 17, 1330, he was appointed chancellor of the exchequer (*C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 28), and was ordered to surrender this office on Oct. 16, 1331, to Robert Stratford (*ib.* p. 184). On Mar. 10, 1338, he was for the second time treasurer of the exchequer (*ib.*, 1338-40, p. 25), but superseded on Dec. 16 by his predecessor, William de la Zouch (*ib.* p. 195). His clerk, John Thorpe, acted for him part of this time, though John seems to have resided in the north. The king had confidence in Wodehouse's knowledge of the affairs of his office; *C.C.R.*, 1337-39, p. 398. He died before Feb. 3, 1346, when his will was proved. His highest ecclesiastical preferment was to the important archdeaconry of Richmond in 1328, and most of his numerous benefices were in the diocese of York. John Wodehouse, keeper of the hanaper of the chancery from 1328 to 1340 and canon of York, was doubtless his kinsman. For Wodehouse's early career, going back to the reign of Edward I., see above, ii. 237, 271.

⁴ *E.A.* 383/17 shows the date. The transfer was at Pontefract on Aug. 21: "anno secundo, quo die idem dominus Ricardus suscepit officium predictum."

ostiarius,¹ he had come into the king's employ after being clerk of Sir William Montague, king's steward, in 1318, and his claim to advancement may well have been his still remembered service with the king's favourite.² It was significant that he was in power in 1330, when Montague made his great stroke for the king's freedom. His promotion to be secondary baron of the exchequer in October 17, 1331,³ gave him, after only brief apprenticeship, a position which Wodehouse did not attain until he had almost completed the labours of a lifetime. Most likely he would have been entrusted with still greater responsibilities but for his death in the following year.⁴

Robert Tawton, who succeeded Garton as keeper, held office from October 16, 1331, to July 30, 1334. The interest of his career is that he owed his introduction to the royal service to bishop Stapeldon. He was a Devonshire clerk, whose name was derived from the bishop's manor of Bishop's Tawton, near Barnstaple.⁵ Indifferently described as "dominus" and "magister," he became a *familiaris* of bishop Stapeldon, who presented him to various West Country livings,⁶ and in 1321 he was steward of Stapeldon's London house outside Temple Bar. On his patron's tragic death, he had courage to accept office as one of his executors.⁷ A long list of preferments to livings and prebends⁸

¹ *MSS. Add.* 17362/13d. He was still *ostiarius* in 1323; *MS. Stowe*, 583.

² Master Thomas of Garton was already, in March 1318, "clerk to the steward," when William Montague held that office; *C.P.R.*, 1317-21, p. 172. I conjecture that when Montague went to Gascony as senechal Garton stayed at home. Yet so late as 1329 he was still called Montague's clerk; *I.R.* 240.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 182.

⁴ He was dead before Dec. 18, 1332; *M.R.K.R.* 109/39d; Cf. *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 518. He had been, since 1318, rector of Over Combe; *ib.*, 1317-21, p. 108.

⁵ This is so clear that I have preferred to call him Tawton rather than "Tauton" or "Taunton." Taunton is excluded because he was clearly from the diocese of Exeter, but "Tauton" and "Tanton," the usual form of the name of the Somerset town are very liable to be confused.

⁶ He was "familiaris episcopi" in 1332, when presented to St. Mawgan in Pyder (*Stapeldon's Register*, p. 256), and steward of Exeter house in 1321 (*ib.* p. 385). Other livings held by him were Bradstone and St. Ervan (*ib.* pp. 193, 252). He was ordained priest on Sept. 18, 1316.

⁷ *Ib.* pp. 561 and 575, "admissus absens . . . caeteris recusantibus." Compare *C.C.R.*, 1323-27, p. 144.

⁸ Among his livings were Tawstock opposite Tawton; Llanbadarn, Cardiganshire; Hadenham, Cambs. His prebends included Abergwili, Dublin, Hastings, Wells, Salisbury and Wingham. He was also archdeacon of Durham, and held the sinecure provostship of Wells; *C. Pap. R. Let.* ii. 387.

marks his progress in the service of the young king. Like other officials nearly attached to the king's person, he became an adherent of Edmund of Kent, and on the earl's fall he was imprisoned and deprived of his goods.¹ The revolution of October 1330 restored him to favour, and his direct promotion to the headship of the wardrobe within a year, besides fresh preferment, and other official work,² shows the high place he held in the young king's counsels. After the example of Bury before him, he was transferred from the keepership of the wardrobe to that of the privy seal, but he died early in 1335,³ before tendering his final account. His cofferer, William Norwell, who had earlier acted as his *locum tenens*, now charged himself with the duty of presenting that account to the exchequer.⁴ That archbishop Stratford, then at the height of his power, acted as administrator of his estates, is some evidence of his importance.⁵ Had he lived, he would, no doubt, like Garton, have been destined for higher things.

Another household officer of the king's youth, who exerted influence in the new reign, was William Cusance.⁶ He had been employed by Edward III. as keeper of the wardrobe of John of Eltham, earl of Cornwall.⁷ After John's death in 1338, Cusance twice became keeper of the king's wardrobe, from May 1340 to November 1341, and again from July 1349 to February 1350. His earlier tenure of this office was ended by his transference to the treasurership of the exchequer, a normal step forward. Five

¹ *C.F.R.* iv. 166, 172, 180-181, and *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 84-85. Among others were William Zouch and William Cliff; Murimuth, p. 254; Baker, p. 44.

² *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 7, prebendary of Bridgnorth; *ib.* p. 32, keeper of Bindon abbey.

³ He was dead before Feb. 20, 1335; *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 79, 80; but alive on Oct. 26, 1334; *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 345.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 419.

⁵ *Ib.*, 1333-37, p. 498, enrols the indenture of June 22, 1335, between Norwell and Stratford as "principal administrators of Tawton's estate," by which Norwell agreed at his own peril to render the account "according to the course of the wardrobe." When the account was presented by June 1336 (*ib.* p. 592), the exchequer still raised technical difficulties. Not until Feb. 1339 was the exchequer finally ordered to pay Norwell his wages for the time of the account; *ib.*, 1339-41, pp. 5-6. Peter Tawton, clerk of chancery, Robert's brother, was his heir. So easily did an administrative family grow up.

⁶ See above, p. 72 and notes.

⁷ He was acting in Nov. 1332 (*C.F.R.* iv. 497), and until the earl's household was broken up on Jan. 18, 1338, after his death (*C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 447, 574). His controller was William of Minden, who in 1338 was also described as "the earl's clerk and secretary"; *C.F.R.* iv. 497.

years later, he was made household treasurer for the second time, an example of promotion backwards.¹ Here Cusance's official career of some thirty-two years ended.

Richard Ferriby, keeper of the wardrobe from July 30, 1334, to August 31, 1337, takes us back to the household of Edward II., in which he had begun as the compatriot and personal clerk of controller Melton. He then became one of the first clerks of the privy seal and afterwards cofferer of the wardrobe, in which capacity he incurred the censure of the reformers of 1323 for his delays in accounting.² He was controller of the king's wardrobe from September 29, 1332, until his promotion to the keepership, and his renewed favour may have been the result of a reaction after 1330 in the direction of the curialistic policy of the last reign. His last office was that of deputy to treasurer Zouch in 1339,³ but his retirement dates virtually from his resignation of the wardrobe,⁴ and it was a younger generation of Ferribys who kept alive in the king's service the name of this East Riding family.⁵

The regularity of official promotion comes out strongly with Ferriby's successors, Edmund de la Beche, William Norwell and William Cusance, who had respectively one, two and one years of office. Of Cusance we have just spoken.⁶ He and Norwell were the last of the young king's wardrobe officials who had held important office under Edward II.

¹ The unusualness of such a step suggests the possibility of the wardrobe keeper of 1349-50 being another member of the Cusance family; but I have no evidence to support the guess.

² See above, ii. 273.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 387.

⁴ See for this *ib.*, 1334-38, pp. 518, 522, 526. The first two are duplicate grants of Sept. 1, 1337, to Richard Ferriby that "in consideration of the goodness, knowledge and fidelity which the king has from early years found in him, and for his good service to Edward II. and the present king, who bears special affection for him, he be retained for life as a member of the king's household and *familia*, so that, whenever he comes to court, he shall be admitted to the household with board and allowances for himself and his household along with wages for life and robes, befitting his estate, from the great wardrobe." In accordance with this, Ferriby received the normal gifts of 8 marks for winter and summer robes in Beche's account of 1337-38 (*E.A.* 388/5, m. 10) and in Cusance's account, 1340-41 (*ib.* 389/8). This was the usual method of providing an allowance combined with an honorary position, for a retiring king's clerk of special merit.

⁵ Notably William Ferriby, keeper of the wardrobe from 1360 to 1361. See later, pp. 146-151. A John Ferriby was controller to Ousefleet, clerk of the great wardrobe, see ch. xiv., in 1327. His counter-roll of coronation expenses has survived in *E.A.* 383/6.

⁶ See above, p. 72 and notes.

Norwell, a member of a minor territorial family in Nottinghamshire,¹ illustrates very completely the graduated rise of the successful wardrobe clerk. Under Edward II. he was clerk of the kitchen in 1313-14, and in 1324 was surveyor of all purveyors.² Transferred to queen Isabella's service, he was with her from 1324-26 in France, and after his return received the treasures of Edward II. stored at Caerphilly.³ His subsequent course was smooth, especially as he accepted the changes of 1330. Cofferer under Tawton (1331-34), he took upon himself the rendering of his account when his chief died in office. He was keeper of the great wardrobe from April 1335 to September 1337, controller of the king's wardrobe from that date to July 1338, then its keeper for the short, but eventful, period between July 1338 and May 1340.⁴ The last of the *garderobarii* of Edward II.'s reign to be given high office by Edward III., he survived to direct for some two years the wardrobe's extended operations which followed upon the great wars with France and Scotland. On his retirement, he was made baron of the exchequer as substitute for William de la Pole.⁵ In 1342, he was appointed to audit the account of Bartholomew Burghersh for his payments to the emperor and the German allies and creditors of the English king.⁶ This is perhaps the last public business with which he can be personally connected. Several members of his family remained in the king's service, one of them, another William Norwell, becoming receiver and wardrobe keeper of Edward, prince of Wales,⁷ and with this namesake

¹ He was named from Norwell, a portion of the Southwell liberty, and held the rich prebend of Norwell Overhall in Southwell collegiate church; *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 418. This was a special preserve of household clerks, and had been held by Melton, Wodehouse and Thoresby; *ib.*, 1327-30, pp. 484, 493.

² *C.P.R.*, 1321-24, p. 435.

³ *E.A.* 398/17.

⁴ See the lists in vol. v. later.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 551, June 21, 1340, "in place of William de la Pole, lately appointed, who is engaged in arraying the account he is bound to render at the exchequer for the time when he was receiver of certain wool, money and goods for the king."

⁶ *Foedera*, ii. 1216. The "nuper custode garderobe" of the writ proves his identity.

⁷ In 1353 this William Norwell succeeded John Norwell as prebendary of Southwell, and John Norwell had, in his turn, succeeded keeper William Norwell to the same; *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 463. The second William Norwell was the prince's receiver in 1346, keeper of the prince's wardrobe from 1345 to 1349, and died in 1363.

the sometime treasurer of the wardrobe is often erroneously identified.¹

Beche was a member of a good Berkshire stock, whose manor house of the Beche in Aldworth gave them their family name.² His early promotion was the more rapid because of the strong position of his lay brother, Nicholas.³ Like another aristocratic official, William de la Zouch,⁴ Beche went from the headship of the great wardrobe to the controllership of the wardrobe; but while Zouch soon abandoned the wardrobe for the exchequer, Beche remained there and attained its keepership. Resigning after a year, he received no higher ecclesiastical promotion than the archdeaconry of Berkshire.⁵ Doubtless the fall of his brother Nicholas, in 1340, stood in the way of his further advancement.

The lay officers of the household of the decade show greater stability than their clerical brethren. Ralph Neville of Raby, appointed steward immediately after the fall of Mortimer, retained office until the spring of 1336.⁶ His successor, Robert Ufford, had been in power for a year only when his appointment as earl of Suffolk raised him to a position too dignified to be compatible with the personal discharge of the functions of a household office.⁷ John Darcy succeeded him as steward, acting from 1337 to the end of 1340.⁸ While Neville represented an ancient house of the second rank, more important in the Durham franchise than in England at large, Ufford and Darcy were new men. Yet all of them were equally zealous in their devotion to the court interest, and as the outbreak of the war strengthened

¹ Notably in the *D.N.B.* s.v. "Northwell," which combines the two Norwells in a single personality with an official record exceeding half a century.

² Its site is now Beche farm. Six fourteenth-century effigies of Beches in Aldworth church represent various members of the house.

³ For Nicholas, see above, iii. 121.

⁴ See for Zouch above, iii. 53, 55, 91, 98, 116-118. Zouch was "nuper clericus specierie" in 1329; *E.A.* 384/1, p. 39.

⁵ He still held that office when he succeeded to Nicholas's settled lands on his brother's death on Feb. 3, 1345 (*Cal. Inq.* viii. 414), to which were added other lands on the widow's death on Oct. 3, 1349 (*ib.* ix. p. 236).

⁶ He acted from Oct. 25, 1330, to Mar. 24, 1336; *Ch.R.* 117/32, 123/20. His father was still alive when he took over this office.

⁷ For Ufford, see above, iii. 37-38. His extreme limits as steward, as shown by his attestations of charters, are Mar. 5, 1336, to Mar. 24, 1337. He seems to have overlapped both his predecessor and his successor, for Neville attested as steward so late as Mar. 24, 1336, and John Darcy began to attest on Mar. 12, 1337.

⁸ See above, iii. 89.

the administrative powers of the household officers, Darcy acquired an increasingly important position in the king's confidence, notably when he was with Edward in the Netherlands.

The fixity of official tenure of the chamberlains of the period was even more pronounced than that of the stewards. The revolution of 1330 did not shake Gilbert Talbot's position, held since 1327, though it led to his combining with it the office of justice of South Wales.¹ He was still chamberlain in July 1334,² but his successor, Henry Ferrars, an associate of William Montague, with whom he shared the custody of the Channel Islands from Easter 1333,³ was acting as chamberlain on March 24, 1337.⁴ The description of him a few days earlier as "continually dwelling by the king's side," suggests that he had already then been admitted to the post.⁵ He was in office on November 27, 1340,⁶ but not much later he was replaced by John Darcy, who was transferred from the stewardship to the chamberlainship.⁷ Ferrars was now an old man and perhaps the times were too strenuous for him; at all events, he died at his own house at Groby on September 15, 1343.⁸ Both he and Darcy were in personal attendance on Edward during the whole of his long sojourn in the Low Countries from July 1338 to February 1340, and were often mentioned as among his chief counsellors.

The increased stability of tenure of the lay officers of the household began with the king's seizure of power in 1330. While the stewards of the minority enjoyed on the average only eight months apiece of office, those of the rest of the reign held their positions for an average period of nearly four years, an average slightly exceeded in the decade under review. As the new

¹ He was already acting justice on Oct. 23, 1330; *C.F.R.* iv. 194. He was still in office on Feb. 20, 1342; *ib.* v. 264. His lands were mainly in Herefordshire and the adjacent March. He died on Feb. 21, 1346, *Cal. Inq.* viii. 520, where some of his estates are given.

² *E.A.* 387/9 shows he received summer robes as chamberlain on July 29, 1334.

³ *C.F.R.* iv. 346 (Feb. 3, 1333). This was a grant to Ferrars, but on Mar. 3, before it became operative, Montague and he received a joint appointment for three years; *ib.* p. 390.

⁴ *Foedera*, ii. 964.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 418 (Mar. 18, 1337). In May 1337, Thomas Ferrars succeeded him as keeper of the Channel Islands; *Foedera*, ii. 969.

⁶ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 649.

⁷ Darcy was acting as steward up to at least Dec. 15, 1340, and his successor, Ralph Stafford, was in office on Jan. 6, 1341. Darcy was acting as chamberlain on Oct. 27, 1341; *C.C.R.* 1341-43, p. 339. I expect he was appointed about Jan 1341.

⁸ *Cal. Inq.* viii. 316.

generation gradually replaced the veterans of the last reign, they found not only more security, but more work. The year 1337, the time of the preparation for serious hostilities, marks the transition to this increased activity.

We are lucky in having from about the same date, means for considerable extension of our knowledge of the details of household administration. For the first ten years of Edward III.'s reign, the surviving records of the wardrobe are unsatisfactory. The most complete are those of the great wardrobe, but those of the wardrobe of the household are only somewhat meagre particulars and enrolments. From 1337 onwards, just at the time when the outbreak of war made fresh demands on the new men into whose custody the wardrobe now came, more detailed records are accessible. It will be convenient, then, at this stage to attempt some general characterisation of the wardrobe activities of these ten years. At once questions arise. How far did the wardrobe reforms of the later years of Edward II. effect their objects? Did they improve the machinery of administration? In particular, did they put an end to the vexatious delay in accounting which had thrown into confusion the finances of the last reign? Was wardrobe activity confined within the limits set by the reforming ordinances?

It is impossible to give a definite answer to any of these questions. There is some evidence that in the beginning of the reign an attempt was made to restrict the wardrobe to its constitutional position, as defined by the reformers of 1323. Thus in the conduct of the Scots war and defence of the border, the main function of the wardrobe was to certify by bill that soldiers and officials had duly performed their task, each with an adequate following. Payments for military wages, however, came from the exchequer, or by the assignment of local issues, which normally would have gone to the exchequer, and for which the exchequer made allowance on production by the claimant of the bill of the wardrobe which was his warranty.¹

¹ For instance, Henry Percy received on Sept. 5, 1327, for wages to his soldiers, a grant from the customs of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and Anthony Lucy, on Mar. 2, 1328, received a similar grant from the issues of Cumberland for his custody of Carlisle castle; *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, pp. 163, 246. The exchequer was later ordered to make tallies for the sheriff of Cumberland for the sum he had thus paid to Lucy.

Even before war came, the wardrobe was gradually creeping back into its old responsibilities. Thus in February 1327, Thomas Featherstonehaugh was appointed to keep the peel at Staworth "so that he answer at the exchequer for the issues thereof."¹ Yet, in November 1328, the late keeper of the wardrobe was ordered to account with Featherstonehaugh for this custody, and "cause to be paid to him what shall be right according to the account."² In the same way the northern sheriffs, ordered to collect victuals for the army assembled against the Scots and to receive recompense from the exchequer for their advances, were sometimes subjected to wardrobe jurisdiction. For instance, the provisions accounts of a sheriff of Nottingham and Derby were audited by the keeper of the wardrobe, who had made an imprest to the sheriff to enable him to carry out his instructions.³

The best proof that the wardrobe had not lost its traditional control over extraordinary war expenditure is seen in the method of payment of the mercenaries from beyond sea, whom John of Hainault brought over to assist queen Isabella in 1326. These troops were retained in the country to give help in the Scots campaign of 1327. Of the very large sum of £55,000, due to John of Hainault on their behalf, more than half was paid by the wardrobe, and a mere trifle by the exchequer.⁴ Contrariwise, the peace envoys to Scotland were paid from the exchequer, although keeper Wodehouse was to certify by bill of the wardrobe the amounts due to them.⁵ Ten years later, in 1337, a pension to a retiring keeper, Richard Ferriby, was made payable either from the wardrobe or from the exchequer.⁶

¹ *C.F.R.* iv. 12.

² *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 336. The formula is not incompatible with the exchequer paying the balance on the bill of Wodehouse, the late keeper, charged with the task of accounting.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 213.

⁴ Two indentures between Mr. John of Paris, clerk of John of Hainault, and keeper Wodehouse show that the king had owed his "cousin" £54,996:19:2½ for expenses between Nov. 9, 1326, and Mar. 10, 1327, in helping queen Isabella and for expenses in the Scots war between May 8 and Sept. 8, 1327. Of this sum £28,352:14:5½ was paid in the wardrobe, and only £4900 in the exchequer; *M.R.K.R.* 104/13d. Other payments were from other sources, and on Mar. 6, 1328, the balance was promised in two instalments. So far as this was fulfilled it was due to the advances of the Hull bankers, Richard and William de la Pole; *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 277; *Foedera*, ii. 733.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, pp. 265, 291.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 522 (Sept. 1, 1337).

Substantially, then, the wardrobe had not so much to pay as to certify to the exchequer for payment. The distinction, though not of great importance from a general financial point of view, was of moment from the point of view of administration, because it indicated one way in which wardrobe executive power was limited. Although the wardrobe pledged the credit of the exchequer, the fact that the exchequer actually paid the money, served as a wholesome check upon wardrobe extravagance and on wardrobe pretensions to authority. In faithful adherence to the ordainers' tradition, the direct income of the wardrobe of the minority came preponderately from the exchequer. The "foreign receipt" of the wardrobe was, in 1327-28, not much over a third of the exchequer receipt. In 1328-29 it had fallen to about one-twelfth, and in the two years 1329-31 it was again a third of the whole.¹

The difficulty of obtaining money otherwise than from the exchequer, and probably also the delay and irregularity in payment of the authorised exchequer grants, reduced the wardrobe to such embarrassments that there could have been little question of it financing extraordinary expenditure. In truth the wardrobe could not from its own funds provide for the daily expenses of the household, which were met only by advances from English and foreign bankers. From an early period of the reign the rising firm of the Poles of Hull, represented by the brothers Richard and William, vied with the Bardi in putting their resources at the disposal of the young king. Richard de la Pole became king's butler in April 1327.² Though thus made a household official, he took the lead in advancing money for the daily needs of the household. Besides their advances to the exchequer for paying the Hainaulters to go home,³ the Poles, within fifteen months of Edward's accession, lent over £500 to the wardrobe, to say nothing of further sums to buy wines.⁴ These sums were to be repaid by the collectors of customs and

¹ The exact figures are 1 Edw. III., exchequer receipts, £65,920:2:8; receipts from other sources, £23,977:14:5½; 2 Edw. III., £19,668:8:10½, and £1611:4:5½; 3-4 Edw. III., £27,173:11:11½, and £9152:19:7½; *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 2/27, 30 and 32; *E.A.* 383/8; 384/1.

² *C.F.R.* iv. 33.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 277; *Foedera*, II. ii. 745, shows that the exchequer thus received £7000 in June 1328 towards liquidating the full debt of £14,000.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 277.

tents, but the officials refused to disburse the money until the exchequer, at the peremptory request of the chancery, drew up the requisite tallies. Either the local officers were determined to have adequate security to cover their actions in this matter, or else the exchequer, from jealousy of the wardrobe, postponed issuing the necessary tallies until they had had specific order from the crown. The same feelings may also be responsible for the regularising, by a new writ, of the payment to the wardrobe of a rent due to the exchequer.¹

Both the Poles and the Bardi continued their advances for the support of the household. Sometimes repayment was imposed upon the exchequer, notably in cases where the revenue handed over to the royal bankers proved inadequate for its purpose.² At other times the wardrobe paid a part, generally a small part, of the obligation.³ The Poles, however, proved more accommodating than the Florentines, and their advances for the support of the household were regularised in the parliament of Northampton in April 1328, when Richard and William united to promise before king and council to find the king £20 a day for the expenses of his household, as well as all the wine that was necessary. As security for repayment, the customs of the chief ports on the east coast, from Newcastle to London, were assigned to the enterprising Hull brethren, and the collectors of these customs were instructed to pay their issues directly to them.⁴ Despite this, there were, more than a year later, further advances for the expenses of the household from the Bardi, who were secured repayment in the same way by assignments from the customs.⁵ Not content with bills of the wardrobe, both the Bardi and the Poles obtained, as additional security, letters obligatory under the great seal.

¹ *C.F.R.* iv. 179 and 180. Even such royal perquisites as a fine paid for the custody of an alien priory went on occasion to the wardrobe and exchequer in equal shares; *ib.* iv. 72.

² *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 483.

³ *Ib.* p. 267, where £200 out of 10,000 marks were paid to Robert of Mold in return for a grant of the reversion of his estates to queen Isabella and others.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, pp. 353-354. The date of the mandate to the collectors was Jan. 6, 1329. The ports concerned were Newcastle, Hartlepool, Hull, Boston, Lynn, Yarmouth, Ipswich and London. But only half the London customs was to go to the Poles, until a previous assignment to the Bardi had wiped off a loan borrowed from them. The inclusion of Hartlepool, a town of the bishopric of Durham, is interesting.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 488. This was a writ of Aug. 20, 1329.

After October 1330, the Poles fell into some discredit through their constant support of Mortimer. Richard Pole, for instance, lost the post of chief butler and collector of the customs on wine, in favour of a Gascon merchant, Arnold Michal.¹ The Bardi gladly stepped into their place as Edward's bankers, and contracted to supply him with £20 a day from November 1 to Christmas, 1330, for the expenses of his household. In the parliament of January 1331 they agreed to continue that sum from Christmas until November 1, "to be paid in the city of London to the keeper of the wardrobe or his attorney." They were to be reimbursed from the customs, and to carry out the bargain the king ordered, with the assent of parliament, that the Bardi should have all the writs under great, privy and exchequer seals as might be necessary for them.² This was, in effect, to put the whole administrative machinery at the disposal of the Bardi. On the expiration of this contract, another one was made on November 15, 1331, when the society agreed to pay a thousand marks per calendar month for the expenses of the household up to October 1, 1332. Again the sums were to be received in the city of London by the keeper of the wardrobe. This suggests that the itinerating wardrobe of the household found it convenient to make use of some fixed premises in London as its head-quarters, perhaps those of the great wardrobe.³ As before, the advances

¹ Appointed Feb. 22, 1331; *C.F.R.* iv. 235, 240.

² *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 280-281. The final indenture is dated Jan. 20, 1331.

³ The text of the indenture in French is given in *C.R.* 151 (5 Edw. III. Part II.) 5d; *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 413-414. The exact words make it clear that the keeper of the wardrobe, "gardeyn de la garderober nostre dit seignour le roi," "tresorer de la garderober" is meant. But the Latin summary enrolled in *P.R.* 177 (5 Edw. III., Part III.) m. 4 and summarised in *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, pp. 228-229, says that the payments are to be made "in ciuitate London. custodi magne garderober nostre." This may be a mere slip, but more likely it is one of the increasingly numerous cases in which one branch of the administration showed ignorance or indifference as to the organisation of offices not directly connected with it. I have referred to the roll in each case, and found that the summary of the calendar accurately expressed its meaning. But later entries of the same sort (see n. 3 on p. 88 below) make it clear that in 1334, when the wardrobe of the household was in the north, there was a "king's wardrobe" in London, that is, a permanent wardrobe depot, which may, or may not, have been the great wardrobe. Its location in the city makes the great wardrobe the most likely place, and, if this surmise is correct, it will be another illustration of the fact that, even at this date, the two wardrobes were not separated into water-tight compartments. It also shows that it was desirable, when the keeper of the wardrobe was absent from London, that he should be represented there by a deputy.

were secured by the assignment of the customs of certain ports, to which was added a portion of the issues of the chamberlains of Wales.

The Poles were not long under a cloud, and soon came back into their own. Financiers, then as now, had no politics, and by 1333 Arnold Michal had given the butlership back to Richard de la Pole,¹ and the Pole firm was eagerly competing with the Bardi to supply the king's necessities. Even in 1331-32 the English as well as the foreign firms were advancing sums for the supply of queen Philippa's household.² The Florentine society was not easily beaten, and at Michaelmas 1334 an indenture of the Bardi was enrolled, wherein the society agreed, "in the presence of the king, chancellor, treasurer and other great men of the council," to promise the king a thousand marks for every calendar month for a year for the expenses of the household, to be paid in London to the keeper or his attorney, in return for the customs of London, Southampton, Boston and Hull.³ When the term of this 1334 indenture expired, the Bardi again contracted to supply, between November 1, 1335, and Michaelmas 1336, 500 marks per calendar month for such expenses, to be paid to the keeper of the wardrobe in London and to be set against the customs of certain ports.⁴

Numerous entries on the chancery rolls show that Edward was indebted to the Bardi for considerable sums beyond these regular advances,⁵ and that he was contracting debts wherever he could find persons willing to lend money to him.⁶ The two

¹ *C.F.R.* iv. 359.

² *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, p. 507.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 345. Compare *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 29. The phrase now is "the king's wardrobe in London." This is interesting, since the court was now established in the north. It emphasises the existence of a permanent wardrobe depot in London, even when the main wardrobe was itinerating in the north or in Scotland with the king. Compare *E.A.* 469/13: "Eidem pro caretis luti emptis pro camera clericorum garderober iuxta portam interiorem terranda." This was in 4-7 Edward III., and suggests an even earlier permanent establishment for wardrobe clerks within Westminster Palace. I owe the reference to Miss Ivy M. Cooper. The mud floor does not suggest much luxury.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, pp. 456-457.

⁵ For instance, *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 6 and 23, where Richard Ferriby is recorded as receiving large sums for expenses of the household and for purchase, beyond the sea, of jewels.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 260, power to the two king's clerks, Master Paul of Montefiore and Master Laurence Fastolf, to raise loans amounting in all to £200,000. This was on July 12, 1336, at Perth.

queens, Philippa and Isabella, were similarly beholden to them, and upon occasion Edward had also to honour their debts.¹ The Bardi were now the "king's merchants"² and general distributing agents.³ They paid loans both to the king's chamber and to the wardrobe⁴; they received on deposit the sums due to the pope from the crusading tenth; the king testified to their "sincere affection" and their "welcome subsidies by loan and otherwise."⁵

But the obligations of even the Scottish war were too arduous to allow Edward to treat with one firm alone. He borrowed money from rival Florentine firms, from the societies of the Acciaiuoli,⁶ the Albertini⁷ and notably the Peruzzi, who now became again the king's merchants, being tardily forgiven their ancient offence of acting as agents to the "king's enemy," Hugh le Despenser, the younger.⁸ Yet on June 24, 1337, John Molyns, chamber knight, and Edmund de la Beche, controller of the wardrobe, were ordered to arrest all "Lombard" merchants, save the Bardi and Peruzzi, and bring them to the Tower.⁹ The concurrent jurisdiction of wardrobe and chamber in respect to loans is well brought out by mandates such as these.

In such circumstances Edward could not rely solely on foreign bankers. When the Bardi's contract to advance 500 marks a month had just been renewed, William de la Pole bound himself before the council to pay for one year, beginning from the same term, namely, Michaelmas 1335, £10 daily to the keeper of the wardrobe for the expenses of the royal household. On May 4, 1336, the king granted to Pole the issues of the old and new customs of Hull and Boston, with authority to collect them, personally or by deputy, without rendering any account thereof at the exchequer.¹⁰ Pole also made other advances for the Scots war, and to William Norwell, keeper of the great wardrobe, for the expenses of his office. Though Pole faithfully discharged his

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, p. 507, and *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 240 and 261, where the king acknowledged on May 6, 1336, £7200 owed by queen Isabella to the Bardi, and promised to repay the same.

² *Ib.* p. 240.

³ *Ib.* pp. 280, 308.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 322, promise of Oct. 3, 1336, to repay 2000 m., delivered in the king's chamber for the king's secret affairs.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 323.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 154.

⁷ *Ib.* pp. 154, 413, 538.

⁸ *Ib.* pp. 277. The advances for "secret business" on pp. 388, 430, 494, suggest loans to the chamber, though repaid at the exchequer.

⁹ *C.F.R.* v. 37, a writ to sheriffs, etc., to aid Molyns and Beche. See also later, p. 287.

¹⁰ *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 265.

obligations, he received no customs from either port, for the king virtually cancelled his orders in Pole's favour by a mandate to those ports to suffer no wool to be exported. Consequently, it was necessary to renew the grant, plus an additional grant from the wool subsidy, before the Hull capitalist could receive his due.¹

The speeding up of the exchequer audit of the household accounts in arrears had already produced some effect in the last months of the old reign. The work was pursued amidst great difficulties under the new *régime*, as we have earlier had occasion to point out.² Certain ancient defaulters, including the executors of Benstead and the venerable bishop Droxford, were "given a day" to render their accounts;³ but frequent postponements retarded the settlement. Some examples will illustrate a tedious process. Droxford's long delayed account for 1308-9,⁴ postponed from September 30, 1326, was considered again on January 14, 1327, when Bedwin, his sometime cofferer, appeared for him and Ockham, only to be postponed again.⁵ He complained that even his account for 34 Edward I. was not yet passed, though it had been examined by the exchequer auditors with great deliberation and care. He was compelled to recite it once more, contrary to the law and custom of account, and especially of wardrobe account. Some of his rivals had done him this disservice, but in February 1327 he obtained a mandate to the exchequer, forbidding them to require him once more to recite that account.⁶ Before the troubles incident to the fall of Edward II. began, Wodehouse was summoned to appear, but he said that he could not account because the clerks of his offices had not yet sent in their accounts, so he asked for an extension of time, and was given until January 20, 1327. Then a further period of grace was allowed until April 27, when he came and accounted for 18 Edward II. Benstead's widow and executrix, Petronilla, submitted her husband's account for 1307-8, and had assigned to her a day, when she answered by her attorney, but her account also was postponed.⁷ So too was the account of Roger Northburgh.⁸

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 332-333. This grant was dated Stirling, Nov. 15, 1336.

² See above, ii. 278-281, iii. 19-20, 47-48.

³ *M.R.K.R.* 103/150.

⁴ *Ib.* 104/75.

⁵ *Ib.* 104/149.

⁶ *C.C.R.* 1327-30, p. 31.

⁷ *M.R.K.R.*, 104/152.

⁸ *Ib.* 151d.

Roger Waltham's account went back no farther than 1322. He was summoned to produce it before treasurer and barons on November 3, 1327. He complied with the order, but told the exchequer that in the time of "certain disturbances" last year in London, his books and memoranda had been deposited by the late king for safe keeping in the treasury of St. Paul's Cathedral. Thence they had been removed to the Guildhall by some of Waltham's civic enemies, so that he could not get them, nor could he, in their absence, array his account. Peremptory orders to the city led to the restoration of the books, and on February 25, 1328, Waltham appeared again, but only to explain that he had not yet had time to put his accounts into proper shape. He was then ordered to be at the exchequer with his books on July 1, and the barons were ordered by writ of privy seal to hear the account and allow Waltham reasonable expenses for its arrayment.¹ On July 1 Waltham was not forthcoming, and the exchequer ordered the sheriff to distrain him, and requested the bishop of London to confiscate his ecclesiastical property.² Despite these coercive measures, nearly a year elapsed before Waltham was brought to book. Only in May 1329 were his final accounts delivered to the exchequer,³ and then a further technical trouble cropped up, which had to be dealt with before they could be considered. This was due to the fact that Waltham's counter-roll was presented by John of Medburn, whom the exchequer refused to recognise as controller. Medburn declared that he had been deputed to that office by Robert Baldock and Robert Wodehouse, the controllers under Waltham. Baldock and Wodehouse combined, after the fashion usual before the ordinances of 1311, the custody of the privy seal with the controllership of the wardrobe, and they had been so much occupied by the business of the privy seal that they had been unable to keep the counter-

¹ This writ was dated May 1, 1328; *M.R.K.R.* 104/75.

² *M.R.K.R.* 104, "Adhuc recorda," m. 110.

³ See above, ii. 279. I should here mention an omission from my earlier account of Waltham. He is often identified with a contemporary scholastic writer of the same name, whose *Compendium Morale* survives in several manuscripts, and is referred to in Fortescue's *Governance of England*. See for this the article on Roger Waltham (under Roger) in *D.N.B.*, and Plummer's notes, pp. 173-175, to his edition of the *Governance*. "The book," says Dr. Plummer, "consists of a series of moral disquisitions, especially on the virtues and duties of princes." The name is so common that it is hard to be dogmatic for or against the identification.

rolls in person and had therefore appointed Medburn to act for them. The pedantic and technical nature of the objection is seen when we remember that, in 1329, Wodehouse was a baron of the exchequer. We should have thought that a word from him on such a point might well have satisfied his colleagues, but it was considered necessary to examine him formally and register his testimony in the matter. Then, relying upon Wodehouse's recorded evidence, the exchequer admitted the validity of Medburn's claim.¹ Even after such delays and precautions, the exchequer was not easily satisfied. In March 1331, Waltham complained that the exchequer was still requiring him to answer for various sums alleged to be due on his account, and prayed for a remedy, a request the king granted.²

It was irrelevant to the actual holders of wardrobe office that the process of clearing up arrears of accounts went on, after the

¹ *M.R.K.R.* 105/153; com. rec. East. t: "De contrarotulis garderobe de tempore Rogeri de Waltham admissis. Memorandum quod cum Rogerus de Waltham, nuper custos garderobe regis Edwardi patris regis nunc, habuisset diem hic modo in crastino Ascensionis Domini [June 2, 1329], ad computandum de garderoba predicta, et liberasset libros de particulis compoti sui de tempore quo fuit custos garderobe predictæ, videlicet a primo die Maij, anno xv° [1322], dicti regis Edwardi patris, usque xix diem Octobris, anno regni eiusdem regis Edwardi patris xvi° [1323], et super hoc quidam Johannes de Medburn' liberasset hic quosdam libros et rotulos, et contrarotulos compoti predicti, quesitum est ab eodem Johanne qualiter dicti contrarotuli ad manus suas deuenierunt, dicit quod quidam magister Robertus de Baldok', iam defunctus, fuit contrarotulator compoti garderobe predictæ, a primo die Maij, predicto anno xv° [1322], usque viij diem Julij, anno xvj°, proximum sequentem [1323?], et quod Robertus de Wodehous fuit contrarotulator compoti eiusdem garderobe, ab eodem viij die Julij usque predictum xix diem Octobris, et pro eo quod predictus magister Robertus de Baldok' inter predictos primum diem Maij, et viij diem Julij, et predictus Robertus de Wodehous inter eundem viij diem Julij et predictum xix diem Octobris, *gesserunt secretum sigillum* dicti patris regis nunc, intendere non potuerunt in propriis personis suis ad contrarotulandum compotum predictum de tempore predicto, et ipse Johannes per eos deputatus fuit, videlicet per quemlibet eorum pro tempore suo ad eundem compotum, eorum nomine, testificandum et contrarotulandum, et ipsos contrarotulos fecit in forma et ex causa predictis. Et super hoc dictus Robertus de Wodehous, nunc baro huius scaccarii, examinatus, dicit et testatur quod predictus Johannes de Medburn', tam tempore prefati magistri Roberti de Baldok', quam tempore suo, deputatus fuit ad dictum compotum contrarotulandum loco et nomine ipsorum ex causa predicta, et dictos contrarotulos fecit, propter quod dicti contrarotuli admittuntur, etc." July 8, 16 Edward II., should be 1322, but it looks as if 1323 were meant here, or else we must revise our dates given in vol. ii. Incidentally we can now add to the list of privy seal keepers of Edward II., Robert Wodehouse, for the whole of his second controllership of the wardrobe.

² *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, p. 213. A similar writ was required for Melton's account of a much earlier date; *ib.* p. 214.

changes in 1330, with even more energy than before, for it was evidence of the activity of the exchequer rather than of the wardrobe. Indeed the chief obstacle to the completion of the wardrobe accounts of Edward II.'s reign seems to have been the rigid meticulousness of the exchequer. It scrutinised the belated bills, and surcharged doubtful items of many years' standing, to men high in office, such as archbishop Melton or bishop Northburgh, or to ancient officials, such as Roger Waltham;¹ and, perhaps more often, demanded payments from the executors of the estates of dead wardrobe clerks, such as John Ockham.² Peremptory and repeated writs of chancery were needed to constrain the exchequer to make reasonable allowances, and so, at last, to bring to an end these interminable proceedings. It even adopted the same attitude towards the chancery.³ Exchequer control then, as treasury control now, meant straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

Under such conditions the exchequer, notwithstanding its augmented staff of auditors of foreign accounts,⁴ was very slow in dealing with the arrears of accounting. The issue rolls of 1330 and 1331 show that the long process which had begun in 1327 was still not completed. For all these five years⁵ the issues to former wardrobe keepers or their representatives loom largely in the rolls, and dead men, like Benstead or Warley, still figure as receiving, through their executors or creditors, money and tallies for ancient debts. Reference to the numerous entries concerning wardrobe accounts is facilitated by the annotation *garderoba* on the left-hand side of the column, and the proportion of these entries to the whole enumeration of issues remains very large. From the beginning of 1330 there are clear

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 213-214, for Waltham and Melton.

² *Ib.* pp. 106-107 and 250.

³ A glaring case of pedantry was the refusal of the exchequer, so late as 1332, to allow bishop Airmyn, keeper of the seal for a few weeks before Jan. 28, 1327, his proportion of the "chancellor's fee" so that the expense of providing food and drink for his clerks was still unpaid five years later. The amount in dispute was only £14; *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 442-443.

⁴ See above, iii. 19-20.

⁵ The issue rolls I have examined for this purpose are now numbered as follows: 225 (1 E. III. Mich.), 228 (1 E. III. East.), 232 (2 E. III. Mich.), 236 and 237 (2 E. III. East. parts I. and II.), 240 (3 E. III. Mich.), 243 (3 E. III. East.), 246 (4 E. III. Mich.), 249 (4 E. III. East.), 253 (5 E. III. Mich.), and 258 (5 E. III. East.).

indications of renewed efforts to reach a settlement. The number of wardrobe entries became overwhelmingly large and then slowly declined to normal proportions.¹ Gradually the issues on account of Edward II.'s reign became restricted, and, when occurring, were not noted as wardrobe entries. By then they had become negligible.

Some accounts were still outstanding, notably that of Wodehouse, for the first period of the new reign. Both Wodehouse and his controller Huggate were too much occupied in the king's service elsewhere to account in person, and their deputies had to contend with grave difficulties. By choosing the same deputy, Mr. John Brunham,² they reduced to futility the double check of an independent roll and counter-roll. For five years the issues to Wodehouse on this account were systematically cancelled by the exchequer auditors, and his accounts unaccepted. A chief reason seems to have been that Wodehouse could not explain the disappearance of a large amount of plate, taken away from the coronation feast by great lords, like the hereditary steward and chamberlain, "in the name of their fees." Wodehouse was also held responsible for valuable jewels and cloth of gold, stolen by robbers from the wardrobe at York, on the occasion of the king's marriage.³ Finally Wodehouse took upon himself the burden,⁴ and little by little the long-standing account was wound up.

Even later accounts were not settled rapidly. For instance, Bury's account, ending in September 1329, was not tendered until the beginning of 1333. Again, the reason was that Bury, now keeper of the privy seal, was continually engaged at the king's side,⁵ and it was only by deputy that he could meet the

¹ Thus two membranes of early March 1330, *I.R.* 246, have in one case (m. 22) 13 "garderoba" entries out of 14, and the next (m. 23) 3 out of 14. *Ib.* 249/2 (April) gives 9 out of 16, of which total one is cancelled and two refer to bad arrears, which are no longer marked "gard," as on the previous roll.

² *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/30.

³ *Ib.* 2/27. For the latter thefts, the usher, John de la Mare, was ultimately adjudged responsible.

⁴ *I.R.* 246 (Oct. 1329) shows that the reason these issues were cancelled was "quia idem custos oneravit se de hac summa et de ceteris summis inferiorum cancellatis de onere ipsius custodis in compoto suo ad scaccarium compotorum." This formula is often repeated in this and in later accounts. As Wodehouse was now treasurer of the exchequer, this obligation was probably only a matter of book-keeping readjustment.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 517-518; *ib.*, 1333-37, p. 9.

exchequer.¹ Garton was ready with his accounts in little more than two months after he left office,² but he died before accounting and his executors had to act on his behalf. A worse case of delay was that of the great wardrobe account of Ousefleet, mainly for Edward II.'s reign, but going on until 1329, which was still unsettled in May 1335.³ The two wardrobes were, of course, now entirely independent as regards accountability.⁴

The government did its best to stimulate accounting. On October 24, 1332, the exchequer received a chancery writ ordering Tawton's first account from October 16, 1331, to September 29, 1332, to be audited at once, less than a month after its completion.⁵ Tawton himself was excused attendance "because the king does not wish him to be long absent from the wardrobe," but Norwell, his cofferer, was to be received in his place, and his controllers were also authorised to appoint anyone they wished, to act as their deputies. When, on November 2, the exchequer began its work, Tawton's last account, which extended to his retirement on July 30, 1334, was not audited immediately because of his death. However, it was delivered to the exchequer, also by Norwell, on January 30, 1336.⁶ It was easier to give orders than to get them executed, for Tawton's accounts were not all audited two and a half years afterwards.

So late as June 29, 1336, after Norwell had rendered Tawton's final account, it required a peremptory mandate to the exchequer to compel it to cease bickering with him as to some of its details.⁷

¹ *E.A.* 383/12 shows a final mandate to the exchequer dated Jan. 2, 1333.

² *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 383-384.

³ *Ib.*, 1330-33, p. 396. The issues to Ousefleet in 1-5 Edward III. are almost as often cancelled in *I.R.* as are those of Wodehouse.

⁴ Thus in *I.R.* the note "garderoba," which denoted up to the end of the minority both wardrobe and great wardrobe issues, became limited to wardrobe issues, those of the great wardrobe being now marked "magna garderoba"; for instance, *I.R.* 246/5; but there are later cases of the earlier practice. Great wardrobe accounts were now beginning to be noted "computatur inde in magno rotulo de hoc anno," while wardrobe accounts were computed "in rotulo compositorum de garderoba." This is a small indication of the way in which the differentiation of the departments was gradually modifying official phraseology.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, p. 501.

⁶ *E.A.* 386/17, is endorsed "Hunc rotulum liberauit hic infrascriptus Willelmus de Northwell, xxx° die Jan. anno etc. decimo." Ferriby's corresponding controller's account was delivered by his deputy on Jan. 30, 1336. It included Norwell's expenses for being at York, Jan. 24 to Feb. 23, for the account. William Dalton assisted him; *ib.* 387/9.

⁷ *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, pp. 541, 567, 587 and 592.

In this energetic action Norwell had shown competence, and had a natural reward in that he rose through the cofferership to the controllership and keepership. Yet he was not able to deliver at the exchequer his counter-roll as controller of Beche's account from August 1337 to July 1338, until April 30, 1341.¹ That was, however, immediately followed by his account as keeper for 1338 to 1340, which was in the hands of the exchequer on May 14.² Norwell was still being persecuted by the exchequer in February 1339 for his own great wardrobe account, which ended in 1337, and had long been presented for audit; and a chancery writ was required to stop such proceedings.³ Again, Zouch, whose last household office terminated in 1335, was still considered to be in arrears in July 1340 "for divers accountable offices in the king's household and elsewhere."⁴

Apart from extraordinary coronation expenses, the early wardrobe accounts of Edward III. were on a sufficiently modest scale. With the king's majority and military undertakings, conditions gradually changed.

Between 1333 and 1337, Edward III. was doing his best to conquer Scotland. After 1337 his main concern was preparation for the war with France. It followed, therefore, that a heavy extra burden was thrown on the wardrobe, and in consequence the policy of limiting the wardrobe to household transactions proper was forgotten. We find that, as under Edward I., the wardrobe in war-time became the main instrument of the temporary war administration. There were, however, two chief differences between the two periods. Under Edward III., the newly separated offices of the great wardrobe and privy wardrobe shared fully in the effort which, in the earlier period, was confined to what was now called the wardrobe of the household. Under Edward III. also, the king's chamber took an active share in the extraordinary labours occasioned by the war. Though each of the four offices had its

¹ *E.A.* 388/9: "Liber contrarotulatoris," endorsed, "hunc librum liberauit ad scaccarium Willelmus de Northwell, contrarotulator garderober, xxx^o die Aprilis anno xv^o regni regis Edwardi tercii a conquestu."

² *M.B.E.T.R.* 203/1d.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 9.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 638. This may be an attempt at persecution by Kilsby, his rival for York. Zouch had been keeper of the great wardrobe, 1329 to 1333, and controller of the wardrobe, 1334 to 1335. He was afterwards keeper of the privy seal from 1335 to 1337, and then treasurer of the exchequer.

own staff and methods, each was after all but a branch of a common system, concentrated round the king, and the distinction between the various household departments must not blind us to their frequent co-operation under a single direction for a common purpose. This purpose, especially in these earlier stages, made an equally exacting demand on the more national offices of the exchequer and the chancery, to say nothing of the privy seal, which was approximating to the same status. The unity of the various offices, and especially of the household offices, is brought out clearly in the detailed wardrobe accounts. The wardrobe of the household still co-ordinated the household departments.

From the beginning of the Scottish disturbances, the wardrobe revenue had to be supplemented proportionately to its enlarged liability. The French war increased that liability, and necessitated a still bigger income. An early result was that, for the first time, the wardrobe accounts drew a firm distinction between the various sources of wardrobe receipts. Up to 1334 it had been enough to lump the receipts together under one heading. As by law the wardrobe's income was derived from the exchequer, the sums received therefrom were generally set down first among the *recepta*; then came the items vaguely described as *recepta aliunde quam de scaccario*, which shrank gradually as the doctrine of the ordinances was grudgingly admitted, in peace time at least, as practical politics. The historian who wishes to examine the types of receipt is grateful to the wardrobe clerks for their systematic method which enables him, at the expense of only a little trouble, to calculate roughly the proportion each bears to the other. With the advent of war, however, when it was essential to economise time and labour, the officials themselves wanted to tell at a glance the source of the different receipts. They therefore indicated not only exchequer and non-exchequer receipt, but also the two sorts of exchequer receipt. The first account in which this was attempted was that of Richard Ferriby for 1334-37.¹ There, the large receipt of over £130,000 was

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/36, makes Ferriby's receipt for the long period between July 31, 1334, and Aug. 31, 1337, amount to £131,608:19:6½ and the expenses £131,808:19:5¾. Of the former £126,807:9:2¼ came from the exchequer. As the "hospicium" expenses were but little above the normal, viz. £32,769:13:5¾, three-fourths of the expenses were on the foreign, i.e. the war, account.

classified into three groups: first, that which came from the exchequer of receipt, in cash and indirectly; then the sums, small to begin with, charged to the keeper at the exchequer of accounts, but of which he had neither direct nor indirect personal handling; and finally, the "foreign" receipt proper, money and credits which never passed through the exchequer at all. The items under the last head were small in amount, but, like the receipt from the exchequer of accounts, henceforth formed a regular subdivision of the receipt, and in the early campaigns of the Hundred Years' War became enormous. How far they developed can best be seen in Norwell's account of 1338-40,¹ when taxes and loans, after the fashion of Edward I.'s time, were poured directly into the wardrobe.

Already the wardrobe accounts were in the habit of distinguishing clearly between the *expensa hospicii* and the *expensa forinseca*. The former represented the cost of carrying on the king's establishment, and were comparatively constant, though even the *rotuli hospicii* became swollen when the king was actively at war. The "foreign expenses" covered the chief cost of fighting and easily expanded to gigantic dimensions with the preparations for hostilities. Even the Scottish wars, fought largely by the local levies of the north, occasioned an increase in wardrobe expenses, though it was, at first, comparatively slight. The year 1332-33, the year of Halidon Hill, though it more than doubled the expenses incurred by the wardrobe during the preceding years of peace, only swelled the household budget to the modest sum of £23,090,² which was less than the receipt of the same period.

The strain on the wardrobe of a brief campaign was trifling as compared with that of the attempt at systematic conquest in the succeeding years. Such an object could not be achieved by a short time levy of the military tenants and the shire infantry. It involved organised professional warriors, permanent garrisons and mobile columns constantly in action. Such military operations could be carried out only by the augmented households of

¹ See below, pp. 102-106.

² *E.A.* 386/12. Expenses, £23,090:2:3, receipt, £24,642:4:11½. The striking feature is the huge proportion which came from the exchequer. The previous year, Oct. 1331 to Sept. 1332, showed a wardrobe expense of £11,160:3:9½; *ib.* 385/19. But here the receipt was only £9400:11:3½.

the crown and of the loyal nobles, who would accept the king's pay and put their retainers at his service for a proper consideration. Accordingly, for the years 1334 to 1337, wardrobe activities were considerably increased. The average expenses of these three years exceeded £40,000 and was greater than that of any period since the extraordinary year of the king's accession and coronation. In all this time the wardrobe and exchequer worked harmoniously together. The exchequer at York was at the base of the king's operations. The wardrobe, closely following the court and army, was the executive agent in the field.

Even the *hospicium* expenses were increased when the royal wanderings involved incursions into hostile territory with adequate guards and the duplication of the administrative machinery. Thus the *hospicium* accounts of keeper Ferriby, from January 1336 to January 1337, show the wardrobe following the king in his perpetual travelling from the north to the south and back again, in the course of which, Edward, at the head of his troops, reached the very heart of Scotland.¹ In January 1336 he moved slowly from Berwick to Westminster, but was again in Scotland from June to September and once more from October to December. Such wanderings involved a division of the government, similar to that which was afterwards established when Edward went for long periods over the channel. Councils were held by the queen in her husband's absence, and the expenses she incurred on the king's behalf, in entertaining the magnates, were duly recorded.²

¹ In 1336 Edward was at Berwick on Jan. 25, York on Feb. 10, Trumpington on Mar. 2-3, and Westminster on Mar. 9. After various wanderings in the south, Edward kept Whitsuntide at Wallingford on May 19, and then went north, reaching Kelso on June 15. On July 18 he was at Elgin, on July 28 back at Perth, and on Sept. 14 at Berwick. On Sept. 22 he opened a council at Nottingham and was back at Peebles on Oct. 18, and Stirling Nov. 2. He was again at Berwick on Dec. 10, and was at Woodstock by Jan. 3, 1337, and at the Tower of London on Jan. 20. The sum of "*hospicium*" expenses was £9967:19:11½; *E.A.* 387/19. Beche, the controller, was represented in the account by his lieutenant, Peter of Carthorp. The interesting letter in Ellis, *Original Letters*, 3rd series, i. 34-39, generally confirms and adds to these details.

² Thus under Tuesday, July 2, when the king was at Perth, there is this note to *E.A.* 387/19: "Isto die domina regina tenuit aulam regis apud Norhamtone, et comederunt secum per ordinacionem consilii tunc ibi tenti, archiepiscopus Cantuarie, vij episcopi viij barones et baneretti et xxviij milites cum aliis diuersis magnatibus et aliis, congressis ad consilium, ipso rege exeunte in partibus Scocie." The entertainment of a great council to dinner was a household expense involving the enlargement of the "*aula regis*." Compare above, iii. 63, n. 1.

Added to this was the cost of the increase of the household on its military side, the provision of war stores and equipment, and the wages, rewards, and compensations for losses, for the warriors.

The results of the preparations for a general mobilisation are still more clearly seen in the elaborate details of keeper Beche's account, ranging from August 31, 1337, to July 11, 1338, as contained both in Norwell's counter-roll of daily foreign expenses and in his ordinary counter-roll for that period. These, forming the first really detailed account of wardrobe activity that has survived for the reign of Edward III.,¹ show the charges both of the actual conduct of languishing operations in Scotland, and of the preparations on a large scale for the anticipated continental campaign. Large sums were spent on dispatching innumerable messengers, bearing royal writs of every kind. Among the writs were orders for the levying of soldiers, for the purchase of stores, of wool, of arms, of horses² and the like, for the discovery of breaches of the wool grant,³ and for the equipment of fortresses.

The headings *feoda banerretorum et militum* show the wide extent of the war preparations of the household. The household forces were divided between those employed in Scotland and those destined, both soldiers and sailors, for continental service. The Scottish expeditions loom largest on the roll. The numbers employed were not great; the periods of service were mostly short, and the constantly fluctuating numbers of each force were meticulously recorded on the pay rolls. The "household troops" included the retinue of Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, "captain of the king's army in Scotland and its March."⁴ From Warwick's retinue four bannerets, thirteen knights, ninety-three men-at-arms and one hundred and seventy-seven horse archers

¹ *E.A.* 388/5. Counter-roll of daily foreign expenses. "11 and 12 Edw. III." is an endorsement in a modern hand. *Ib.* 388/9 is Norwell's controller's account.

² For instance, John Grimsby, clerk of the marshalsea of the household, was sent by the king from the Tower of London to the markets of Abingdon, St. Ives and St. Neots, to buy horses for the king's passage. Walter Westway was similarly employed.

³ John Ferriby, clerk of the privy seal, was sent "*ad superuidendum capcionem lanarum et ad inquirendum de lanis occultatis seu elongatis*," in the shires of Oxford, Berks, Somerset, Dorset and Wilts, from May 7 to June 18, 1338, at 4s. a day.

⁴ "*Dux et capitaneus exercitus domini regis in partibus Scocie et in marchia eiusdem.*"

drew pay from August 31 to September 13.¹ Besides this there were field forces engaged in the siege of the castle of Dunbar, and in the relief of Edinburgh castle, a garrison for Wark and a larger one for Berwick, and the retinues of the various magnates, including the bishop of Carlisle, entrusted with the government of Lothian and the defence of the Marches. A rough calculation shows three earls, one bishop, seven to nine bannerets, about one hundred knights, seven hundred men-at-arms and about eight hundred horse archers and hobelers, enrolled for pay from the wardrobe for the Scottish forces. It would, however, be rash to deduce from that the whole number serving, for only selected soldiers received the king's pay, and this pay apparently soon came to an end.² All were horsed, except some three hundred and forty foot archers, two hundred of whom came from Cheshire. It is clear, however, that, even before hostilities began with France, the garrison of Scotland was weak and the government worked at York to little purpose.

Side by side with these details, we note the household contribution to the fleet north of the Thames, of which Sir Walter Manny was admiral.³ In the autumn of 1337 there were Manny himself, five knights, thirty-three men-at-arms and two hundred *armati*, lightly equipped men-at-arms, from the city of London, besides one thousand Welshmen with their twenty-seven officers. For Manny's seventy-six ships there were on the pay list one thousand, eight hundred and forty-four sailors, seventy-six masters, and the same number of constables and pilots.⁴

From November 15 to 28, 1337, was the period of the first hostilities in the French war, including the devastation of Cadzand. There is a record, too, of troops collected for an autumn passage, which never materialised, into the Netherlands. A good deal

¹ The normal scale of payment was as follows: the earls had 8s., each banneret 4s., each knight 2s.; the man-at-arms 1s. a day. The "armatus," the horse archer and hobeler were paid 6d. or 4d. and the archer 2d.

² For instance, the Wark retinue ceased to draw wages on Nov. 18 "*quo die omnes redierunt ad proprias partes.*" On Feb. 1, 1338, Lucy, justice of Lothian and keeper of Berwick, relinquished those posts, and on Jan. 30 Molyns and his retinue, reduced to two men-at-arms, returned home.

³ "*Admirallus flete ab ore Tamisie versus partes boreales.*"

⁴ "*Eidem baneretto (i.e. Manny) pro vadiis et stipendiis lxxvj lodesman-norum conducencium dictas naues per mare usque ad partes Flandrie et exinde ad partes Selandie pro lodmanagio suo.*"

was spent in paying these forces,¹ yet before the end of the year nearly all were dismissed, except the retinues of Molyns and Kilsby, who were sent to Scotland for a short period.² The wages of eighteen knights, eighty-one men-at-arms, seventy-three horse archers and one thousand North Welsh archers, "newly chosen," assembled at Cardiff for the expedition of 1338, were also included in the account. Some of these, notably the retinue of William Bohun, earl of Northampton, began to receive pay as early as May 24, though it was not until June 28 that Northampton crossed the North Sea. The others waited for the king's passage. More wages were paid to the fleet, but on the eve of Edward's departure the account was closed, Beche left office and his controller, Norwell, was appointed keeper of the wardrobe and accompanied the king abroad. The preliminaries of war were, however, costly enough. The total "foreign expenses" of the Beche roll amounted to over £23,000, and all were practically war charges.³

Even more instructive than Beche's account is that of his successor, Norwell, which covers the whole period of the early Netherlandish campaigns and negotiations, and the three months after Edward's return to England. The conflict between the ministers following the court, and the ministers in charge of the government at home, which resulted from the failure of the home government to finance adequately these costly operations, has already been discussed, but Norwell's happily detailed record⁴

¹ For instance, there were 396 South Welsh infantry under Sir John Langton, two esquires and two constables, besides their own officers, namely, one chaplain, one medical officer, one crier, four standard-bearers and twenty "vintenarii." All received wages, 2s. to Langton, 1s. to the esquires and constables, 6d. to the next three persons, 4d. to the twenty-four in the next two classes. The pay for each archer was 2d. All pay began from Aug. 31: "quo die se moverant a partibus propriis Londoniis, ibidem expectantes passagium"; and was withdrawn on Nov. 26: "quo die omnes licentiati fuerunt." There was a corresponding force of 297 from North Wales with similar officers, who were dismissed on Nov. 20. The Welsh alone had provision for chaplains and medical officers at the king's cost.

² Kilsby's knight, eleven men-at-arms and forty-four archers waited at London from Aug. 31 to Sept. 11, "expectantes passagium regis," and then a selection from them was sent to Scotland.

³ The exact sum is £23,037:6:4½, of which "vadia guerre" were £12,109:3:6, and "munitiones et operationes villarum et castrorum" (all in Scotland or the March) were £6097:2:10.

⁴ "Liber de particulis compoti Willelmi de Northwell," in *Misc. Books of the Exchequer*, T.R. 203, extending from July 12, 1338, to May 27, 1340, inclusive.

has still to be examined from the narrower point of view of wardrobe history, especially of the share played by the wardrobe in the administration of the war.

To begin with, the whole office of the wardrobe remained abroad with the king for the duration of his stay in the Netherlands, and indeed somewhat longer. The same necessity which had compelled the establishment of a permanent office of some sort in London now led to the concentration of the wardrobe at Antwerp. While some of the houses hired for administrative purposes at Antwerp were secured for such a short period as three months, the houses hired for the king's wardrobe were engaged from July 22, 1338, for a whole year.¹ We have seen already how numerous and vital were the functions which it discharged; how it replaced the exchequer as the authority for the receipt and control of customs, and in other ways as well;² and how it was the centre of the whole administration of the state and army in the Netherlands.³

¹ *Ib.* 203/190. "Waltero atte Brok pro domibus suis conductis ibidem pro garderoba domini regis a dicto xxii^o die Julii per unum annum integrum, xviii lib." There were houses hired "pro rege pro mora sua infra castrum de Andewarpe, et per infortunium combuste," "pro domina Johanna, filia regis," and for various household offices, "pro coquina, aula regis, sparseria, candelaria et pauillonaria; pro garderoba robarum regis, pro militibus camere, pro pueris camere, pro wafferaria regis," and also for the chamberlain, Sir W. Manny, and other officials, and one "pro prisona regis." The "pauillonaria" was a great wardrobe office, and the great wardrobe was permanently kept at Antwerp. See later, p. 390.

² See above, iii. 91-92.

³ Though the accounts were submitted to the exchequer, the exchequer's power of revision was limited by categorical directions under the privy seal; e.g. *M.R.K.R.* 117, breu. dir. bar. East. t.: "Baronibus pro Willelmo de Northwell. Edward par la grace de Dieu etc. as tresorer et barons de nostre eschequer, saluz. Come nous eons comande a nostre cher clerk William de Northwell, nadgairs gardein de nostre garderobe, qil face allouer a noz gentz qi ont este ouesques nous es parties de dela en nostre service, gages solonc ce qe feust assentuz par noz et nostre conseil illoques, cestassauoir a chescun counte, pur les gages de son corps desmesne, un marc le iour del vintisme secund' iour de Juyl, lan de nostre regne Dengleterre douszisme, queu iour, nous arriuasmes en Brabant, tanqe au sezisme iour de Novembre, lan de nostre dit regne treszisme, lun et lautre iour acompte, et pur le passage de sys chiuax deuers Engleterre quarante soldz, a chescun baneret pur gages de son corps le iour, oyt soldz, et pur le passage de cynk chiuax deux marcz et demy, a chescun chiualler pur gages de son corps le iour quatre soldz, et pur passage des quatre chiuax, deux marcs, et a chescun homme darmes pur gages de son corps le iour, deux souldz, et pur le passage de trois chiuax vint souldz, et a chescun archier a chiuall sis deniers le jour, et a chescun archier a pee, trois deniers le iour, pur tout le temps susdit, rebatue totefoitz la quatre partie des gages des gentz darmes, aussibien des baneretez et

These facts are well brought out by the illuminating figures of Norwell's account,¹ for which Richard Nateby was controller,² and William Dalton cofferer.³ In two months less than two years the unprecedented sum of £262,721 was received by the wardrobe. Of this the exchequer supplied, in one form or another, only a little over £108,000. The rest came largely from loans made to the wardrobe, to which the Bardi and Peruzzi contributed some £8692, the merchants of Asti £9897 : 6s., a group of German merchants £5000, William de la Pole £46,389 : 19 : 10½, and Paul de Montefiore, in loans and in proceeds from the sale of wool, £7990 : 6s.; from the sale of royal lands, on account of which £22,307 : 8 : 2 were paid in by William de la Pole; and from customs and subsidies, the sale of wool and the usual other sources. The wardrobe expenses amounted to £220,156, of which £23,746 were *expense hospicii* and £196,390 were "foreign," and the prests reached the high figure of £116,947. Altogether the wardrobe was responsible for an outlay of some £337,104. This left a multitude of debts for future treatment, for while Norwell's gross deficit was £74,382, his net deficit was only

chialers, come des cleres et esquiers qe mangerent en nostre sale es dites parties pur le temps qils y mangerent. Et del dit sezisme iour de Nouembre tanqe au vintisme iour de Feuerer, queu iour nous preismes nostre passage hors de nostre terre de Flaunders deuers nostre roialme dengleterre, a chescun counte pur toutes maners des despens' et gages cink marcs le iour, a chescun baneret, quarant souldz le iour, a chescun chialer, deux souldz le iour, a chescun des esquiers des ditz chialers douze deniers le iour, vous mandoms qe a dit William facez auer, santz empeschement ou contredit, allouance des toutes choses auandites. Done souz nostre priue seal a Londres le quatre iour de Juyn, lan de nostre regne Dengleterre quatorzisme et de Fraunce primer." The military hierarchy found no place for the "baron" between the earl and the banneret. See on the political bearings of this, above, iii. 296, nn. 1 and 2, and 346, n. 2.

¹ *M.B.E.*, T.R. 203; *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/15, 16.

² Nateby had been through all the inferior offices. He was clerk of the pantry and buttery from 1328-29 (*E.A.* 384/1, 9) to Tawton's time, 1331-34 (*ib.* 385/19); and cofferer under Beche, 1337-38 (*ib.* 388/5).

³ *M.B.E.* 203/276. He became cofferer on July 12, 1338, when Nateby was made controller. We find him acting under Norwell when Norwell was keeper of the great wardrobe in 1335-37, notably in purchasing cloth and other commodities, and in providing for the transport of the great wardrobe; *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 123, 161, 244, 320, 425, 471. He was also employed in securing the king's debts from Tawton's estate after that officer's decease; *ib.* p. 80; *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, pp. 386, 419, 587. It looks as if Norwell's favour brought Dalton into the wardrobe of the household and procured his promotion, within a year of his employment there, to the post of cofferer. For his career and family connections see later, pp. 130-131, n. 7.

£1207.¹ As the household expenses were but slightly in excess of £12,000 a year, the account was really an account for the war expenditure of the king in the Netherlands for the period it covers. The details throw a flood of light on the field and methods of wardrobe administration, which is here represented on the most extensive scale known to the whole Edwardian period. It must not, however, be thought that the large sums actually passed through the wardrobe coffers. The usual method adopted was to give the royal creditor abroad a "bill of the wardrobe," or some corresponding evidence of his claim, which he presented to the exchequer. The failure of the exchequer to

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/16. The figures must not be relied upon too implicitly, for the book of particulars and the enrolment do not tally, although the figures of the enrolment are to be preferred as being more final than those of the book of particulars. A number of the expenses items in that book seem to have been cancelled without the corresponding alteration always having been made in the totals. We cannot, therefore, be sure of the accuracy of the summary of expenses in a later hand on the last page (p. 362) of the book. The gist of it may, however, be given as representing the extreme turnover of the wardrobe for any mediæval period :

Expenses : Household	.	.	.	£23,746	1	8½
Foreign	.	.	.	269,598	12	1
Prests	.	.	.	116,947	10	7½
Total	.	.	.	£410,292	4	4½

Unfortunately the lower part of the page on which the receipts were summarised has, at some time, been cut away, but on p. 39 the receipt from the exchequer of receipt is given as £86,576 : 4 : 6½, and on p. 51 the receipt from the exchequer of accounts is given as £21,820 : 19 : 0½, so that, according to this reckoning, the total exchequer receipt was £108,393 : 3 : 6½.

The totals afforded by the enrolment are :

Receipts : Exchequer of Receipt	.	.	.	£86,076	4	6½
Exchequer of Accounts	.	.	.	22,018	17	9½
Foreign	.	.	.	2,291	0	8
Bardi loans	.	.	.	8,692	13	4
Customs, subsidies, etc.,	.	.	.	£143,143	2	0½
Total	.	.	.	£262,721	18	3½

Expenses :	£220,156	18	9
Prests :	116,947	10	7½
Total expenses and prests	£337,104	9	4½
Deficit	£74,382	11	0½

From this were deducted £73,175 : 6 : 1, owed by the wardrobe to divers creditors, for which the keeper was not personally responsible, leaving a clear deficit of £1207 : 4 : 11½ to be accounted for later.

meet such bills, and its equally signal inability to send cash in sufficient quantity beyond sea, exasperated the court and household and made its representatives naturally antagonistic to exchequer pretensions.

A month before the king's second expedition to the Netherlands, William Cusance succeeded Norwell as keeper, but the other officers—Nateby the controller, and Dalton the cofferer—were not changed. In June 1340, Cusance and his office accompanied the king overseas, witnessed the battle of Sluys¹ and remained in the Netherlands until sometime after the king's sudden return on November 30 following. Cusance's account is only less important than that of his predecessor.² The smaller scale of its expenditure is due, not so much to the comparative brevity of the period of war, as to the more restricted operations and the financial exhaustion of the English king. After brief sojourns at Sluys and Bruges, Edward devoted his main energies to the conduct of the abortive siege of Tournai. His great difficulty was that no money came from England, despite his constant appeals. It followed that Cusance spent most of his time away from the court which was established in the neighbourhood of the besieged city,³ and busied himself with seeking supplies for the army, at Brussels, Bruges and Ghent. On the other hand, when the king left Ghent for home on November 27, Cusance stayed behind, again visiting Bruges early in

¹ *Cont. Hemingburgh*, ii. 357, relates how, at Sluys, "illi vero qui erant in nave ubi garderoba regis Angliae posita est, praeter duo homines et mulierem quandam omnes occisi sunt; navis tandem postea ab Anglis adepta est." I can find no trace of this disaster in Cusance's account or in any other source. If the story is true at all, it must have reference to the itinerant "garderoba robarum." Certainly the loss of any conspicuous member of the wardrobe of the household would have left traces in the accounts. Equally difficult to be clear about is the story in *Chron. de Melsa*, iii. 65-66, of how a fire at Antwerp drove Edward from his bed. See also later, pp. 116, n. 1, and 482, n. 2, for a similar wardrobe fire in 1347, outside Calais.

² The greatest detail of his operations is found in *E.A.* 389/8, a "journal" not surviving in a complete form, though probably originally covering the whole of the period of the account from May 27, 1340, to Nov. 21, 1341. The first item is Aug. 3, 1340, at Ghent. But it includes nearly a year at home at the end of the account. It is most illuminating for the period spent abroad.

³ He was at Ghent for twenty-nine days before Aug. 28, at Brussels on Sept. 4, at Bruges, Sept. 13, and at Ghent and Bruges for twenty-eight days before Oct. 14, seeking for supplies, "missus per regem de exercitu coram Tournai vsque Brugiam et Gandavum pro cheuanciis denariorum ad opus domini regis faciendis." See also p. 108, n. 3.

December, and Ghent in the middle of the month. Then only did the wardrobe return to England, just before Christmas 1340.¹

In the same way the chamber clerk, John of Askeby, was eighty days out of court, endeavouring to collect in various Flemish regions the money arising from the custom of wool, granted to the king in England.² The energetic Kilsby was fighting as a banneret for the whole of the period of operations.³ The other leading clerks each had his *comitiua* of men-at-arms and archers. Their normal status was that of a banneret. Thus, not only Kilsby, but Hatfield, clerk of the chamber, and even Philip Weston, almoner and confessor of the king, had wages for themselves and their retinue *tanquam baneretti*. Cusance, though not thus described, had an equal retinue and the same rate of wages as a banneret.

There were over £20,651 paid as wages of men-at-arms.⁴ In contrast with some earlier accounts, there was a considerable charge for wages for foot archers, each of the bannerets and knights, at the head of a retinue, receiving a certain sum for this purpose.⁵ These "foreign" expenses, moreover, account for an unusual portion of Cusance's deficit.

¹ The entries in Cusance's wardrobe accounts (*E.A.* 389/8) show that the wardrobe with its officers remained in Flanders after the king's flight. Cusance was still receiving letters at Bruges up to Dec. 8, and there were almost daily payments out of the wardrobe up to the same day. On Dec. 15 and 16 large payments were made, amounting to over £2000, all "gifts in compensation for damages or rewards of service in the field or in Flanders." One of these, a gift to the abbot and monks of Antwerp, to recompense the damage caused by the long stay of the king and queen in their house, was paid by the Bardi at Bruges. It looks as if the wardrobe were only released by the Flemings after it had, through the advances of the Bardi, paid off some of the king's most pressing obligations. There is then a break of ten days with no entries. On Dec. 26 English entries begin in a different ink, with the offering of the king to the shrine of St. Edward at Westminster "in aduentu ipsius regis ibidem." When did the queen, the royal children and her wardrobe return?

² "Magistro J. de Askeby, clerico assignato per regem et consilium ad colligendum in partibus Flandrie denarios provenientes de quodam subsidio domino regi concesso de custuma lanarum in Anglia," at 4s. a day.

³ He received wages as banneret from June 24 to Sept. 29.

⁴ *E.A.* 389/8, mm. 11, 12. The exact sum is £20,651:9:2.

⁵ *Ib.* mm. 12-14: "vadia sagittariorum." The earl of Lancaster was allowed 63 "sagittarii pedites" at 2d. and 3d. a day. Northampton 152 at the same wages for 200 days, Walter Manny 137 at 2d. for 54, and 136 at 3d. for 98 days, Kilsby 112 at 3d. for 98 days, and Cusance 10 at 3d. for 98 days. The sum total was £2311:5:2. The range of Cusance's account from May 27, 1340, to Nov. 21, 1341, makes it begin too early and end too late to make it easy to disentangle the material relevant to wardrobe work during the Netherlandish campaign.

Just as the earlier part of Cusance's account vividly illustrates the king's campaign abroad, so the latter portion of it is valuable for the light it throws on the struggle between the curialists and the Stratfordians after the wardrobe had returned to England. The very changes in personnel are significant. Thus, controller Nateby was, on April 17, 1341, replaced by Robert Kilsby. He was brother of the organiser of the household forces, and had held abroad the humbler post of clerk of the spicery. On Darcy's transference from the stewardship to the chamberlainship, Ralph Stafford became steward. He received allowance for six days "out of court," when he went on two missions to Canterbury to carry on the campaign against archbishop Stratford.¹ William Kilsby was still too busy to be much at court and took similar allowances for 248 days.² After the worst troubles were over, the general excuse given for non-residence was the necessity of remaining at London to attend the king's council. This suggests that already the normal place for meetings of the council was at London, and that the king was generally absent from meetings of the council, or, more probably, that he was already acquiring the habit, which became inveterate in later life, of constant absence from London.³

Throughout, the account shows that a large proportion of the wages, robes and expenses of the officers of the chamber were included in the wardrobe account. The wardrobe was also still charged with the wages of councillors and ambassadors, and with the wages and robes of the keeper and clerks of the privy seal.

¹ Feb. 4, 1341. "*Domino Radulpho de Stafford, senescallo hospicii regis, misso per regem de Londoniis usque Cantuariam per duos vices et existendo extra curiam eundo, morando et redeundo, per sex dies.*" The allowance was the usual one of 20s. a day.

² This is entered under Robert's period as controller, but as that period only includes 219 days, it looks as if it extended over the whole time of Cusance's account. Elsewhere he was paid 25s. a day expenses for himself and his clerks, "*existenti ad consilium regis extra curiam per cxvj dies*" between May 27 and Nov. 24, 1341.

³ In 1341 there was a payment for expenses of £18: "*Domino Radulpho de Stafford, senescallo hospicii regis, moranti apud Londonium extra curiam in negotiis regis ad consilium suum ibidem tentum per xvij dies mensibus Martii et Aprilis.*" Compare "*Domino Willelmo de Cusancia, custodi garderobe regis, moranti extra curiam regis apud Westmonasterium et alibi, pro denariis ad expensas hospicii regis persequendis.*" The period was Dec. 25, 1340, to April 16, 1341, and the allowance 20s. a day. Kilsby and his clerks were allowed expenses for 116 days at the council "*extra curiam*" between May 27 and Nov. 24, 1341, a period of 182 days in all. See also iii. 115.

The interdependence of wardrobe, privy seal and chamber, so strongly emphasised in the Walton ordinances, still survived. The habitual absence of wardrobe officers from court shows that their functions extended almost as much to the government of the nation as to the direction of the household. This was especially true of the keeper of the privy seal too, as we shall see later, and in a lesser degree of officers whose tasks were more obviously domestic.

The whole of Cusance's account, not merely that part dealing with the period of the king's absence beyond sea, was on a more restricted scale than was the preceding account of Norwell. The charge for "foreign account," that is practically for war purposes, had indeed been curtailed by the time Robert Kilsby became controller, amounting for the whole term of seven months to only £4359 : 12 : 6, as compared with £33,501 for the eleven months of Nateby's period of office.¹ This was mainly because there were few military expenses when the household was in England, though the king still had to pay the wages of Henry of Lancaster and other less distinguished persons, held in pawn by his Netherlandish creditors.² Even with this reduction, Cusance's account involved expenses amounting to £52,141, against which there was only a receipt of £42,972.³ Both the proportion of excess of expenses over receipts, and the proportion of foreign expenses, were greater than those of Norwell's account. No wonder that the king abandoned campaigning in despair, or that Cusance's subordinates spent three hundred days in the arrayment and tendering of his account,⁴ and were only ready to meet the exchequer after at least two years' delay.

¹ The items were "elemosyna, £75 : 3 : 2; necessaria, £2219 : 6 : 4; dona, £1336 : 18 : 4; feoda, £193 : 8 : 8; robe et calciature, £445 : 12 : 0; nuncii, £89 : 6 : 0." The sum of the "expensa forinseca tam de tempore R. de Nateby quam R. de Killesby" was £37,861 : 8 : 1½.

² "Domino Henrico de Derby moranti in hostagio apud Maghliniam," expenses at 5 marks a day from April 17 to May 26, paid on Nov. 24, 1341.

³ "Recepta de scaccario, £25,910 : 15 : 8½; recepta forinseca, £17,062 : 3 : 4; summa, £42,972 : 19 : 0½; summa expensarum, £52,141 : 15 : 9½."

⁴ "Et eidem custodi pro expensis unius clerici sui, coffrarii, unius clerici contrarotulatoris et aliorum clericorum suorum existencium circa arraacionem et reddicionem istius compoti per ccc dies." The period was between Dec. 1, 1341, and Feb. 26, 1343. The amount of expenses was 5s. a day, a sum fixed by the barons of the exchequer as that already allowed to previous keepers from Waltham to Ferriby.

On October 28, 1341, Cusance was promoted to the treasury of the exchequer, and on November 25 was replaced as keeper of the wardrobe by William Edington. It was still not usual for the keeper of the wardrobe to be selected from outside the ranks of wardrobe clerks who had gained experience, as subordinates, of the routine of the office. But Edington's administration of the ninth in the region south of Trent justified his appointment to the headship of the wardrobe, which post he retained for two and a half years, resigning it on April 10, 1344. Robert Kilsby remained controller until he was succeeded on July 26, 1342, by the experienced Walter Wetwang. Wetwang had been clerk of the pantry and buttery under Cusance, and his faithful service resulted in his promotion to the keepership when Edington gave it up. William Dalton, Cusance's cofferer, continued in that office almost, if not quite, to the end of Edington's keepership.¹ The inferior clerks included John Grimsby, clerk of the pantry and buttery; William Huggate, clerk of the marshalsea; John Ampelford, clerk of the market; and Alan Killum, Richard of Eccleshall and Richard Murimuth, clerks of the wardrobe.² Of Eccleshall we shall hear again.

In the early part of Edington's keepership the wardrobe was active in financing and administering the important Scottish expedition of the winter of 1341-42.³ Between October 1342 and March 1343, it attended the king on his Breton expedition, which was largely conducted under Edington's direction.⁴ We find Wetwang, the controller, actively co-operating with Sir Walter Manny in organising the transport of the army beyond sea, and in smoothing over the difficulties caused by mutinous sailors who refused to allow men and horses to embark on their ships at Southampton until they had received their arrears of

¹ I infer this from *M.B.E.* 204/12d, 82d, 101, 103d, 104.

² *Ib.* 204/90d, 104.

³ *Ib.* ff. 37-43, gives the itinerary of the household. Christmas 1341 was passed at Melrose; *ib.* ff. 38-40. Edington, left behind in London, and finally taking £2000 to Melrose, was out of court for 39 days; *ib.* f. 157.

⁴ The itinerary of the "hospicium" shows it at Portsmouth on Oct. 16, 1342, and still, on Oct. 25, "super costeram Anglie," but on Oct. 27 "in portu de Brest"; *ib.* ff. 65, 67. Then a month of wanderings till Nov. 29, "ad obsidionem de Vanes." The household left that region early in Feb. 1343, and on Feb. 28 was "in mare." It landed at Melcombe and reached London on Mar. 8. The voyage home was tempestuous, some ships were wrecked and the king and army "miraculose salvi ad Angliam pervenerunt"; Avesbury, p. 352.

pay.¹ Along with them Hatfield, still clerk of the chamber, was also employed.² Equally active was John Offord, who, like Kilsby earlier, kept both great and privy seals, and negotiated the truce of Malestroit which enabled Edward to return home.³ The conditions of 1338 and 1340 persisted in the Netherlands, although the royal operations were now on a much more restricted scale.

For the two and a half years of the account the whole wardrobe receipt attained only the modest dimensions of £68,637, of which £60,801 came from the exchequer and only £7836 represented the foreign receipt. Not much less than half of the exchequer receipt accrued only after the termination of the account,⁴ and that was due to the personal action of Edington, as treasurer of the exchequer, in order to make his account as treasurer of the wardrobe appear less unsatisfactory. The underlying motive was doubtless to make the over-spending of the wardrobe less obvious; but even with these supplementary payments the recognised expenses of the account attained the high figure of £87,838, leaving an adverse balance of £19,201.

This is more than accounted for by the war expenses incurred in Scotland and Brittany, where war wages alone amounted to £41,294.⁵ There were also many debts of the wardrobe, notably

¹ See, for instance, the letter of the king of April 4, 1342, printed in Viard and Déprez, *Chronique de Jean le Bel*, ii. 326-327.

² See *ib.* ii. 329-330.

³ Murimuth, pp. 130, 134. Offord is described as "archdeacon of Ely" simply. As the sole clerk employed on the English side, he probably took the main part in drafting the treaty.

⁴ The details of the exchequer receipt in *M.B.E.* 204/3d-15 are very curious. They are highest in the first year and fall off notably from Michaelmas 1343. During Cusance's treasurership of the exchequer, which practically coincided with Edington's keepership of the wardrobe, the sum only amounted to £36,448 : 8 : 6. Edington became treasurer on April 10, 1344. He thus gave up the wardrobe at the very beginning of Easter term, 18 Edw. III. After that date the receipt of the wardrobe from the exchequer during Easter term, 18 Edw. III., was £5581 : 17 : 3½, and during Michaelmas term, 19 Edw. III.—*i.e.* up to Easter 1345—was £12,503 : 14 : 2½. Even after this, the exchequer continued payments to Edington's wardrobe account, and the sum of these during Edington's treasurership of the exchequer amounted to £24,352 : 19 : 8½.

⁵ *M.B.E.* 204/104d. "Summa vadorum guerre Scocie, £10,821 : 11 : 10"; *ib.* f. 111d. "Summa vadorum guerre in partibus Britannie, £30,472 : 11 : 0½." "Summa in Scot. et Brit., £41,294 : 2 : 10½." There was also "vadia marinariorum, £5,540 : 12 : 3; restaurum equorum, £3407 : 6 : 8." The "hospicium" expenses of £25,607 : 4 : 9½ were, of course, increased by war conditions; *ib.* f. 123. Besides these there is a heading (f. 127) "denarii debiti diuersis de vadiis guerre et de restauro equorum et de robis suis," to say nothing of other debts. At least two-thirds of the expenses arose directly from the wars.

war obligations still unpaid. Despite these burdens, Edward was able, by 1344, to redeem his great and small crowns deposited as pledges to his creditors.¹ In the light of these facts it is easy to see why the clerks of the keeper and controller were at work between April 11, 1344, and May 13, 1345, a period of 398 days, on the arrayment of the account,² and why the account, which was formally delivered to the exchequer on January 20, 1345,³ is not precisely the account which we can now read in the controller's book preserved in the exchequer archives. Neither can we be surprised that the successive controllers preferred to discharge their task by deputy, nor feel too confident as to the accuracy of details plainly added after this date.⁴

The "course of the wardrobe" still remains something of a mystery, and mediaeval accountancy is not easily to be understood by moderns who are necessarily deprived of the advantage of mediaeval direction into its methods. It was, we surmise, an advantage in getting accounts audited, when the official superior of the auditors was the person who, in a prior capacity, had been responsible for the figures sent up for audit. Forty-five years earlier, in the days of Walter Langton,⁵ the wardrobe keeper, promoted to the treasury of the exchequer, had scruples as to the auditing of his own accounts. By Edington's time these scruples had disappeared, and this particular problem of audit did not disturb him. Henceforward the mediaeval official had upon occasion the good luck to be able to audit his own accounts. Modern experiences must warn us of the difficulty of balancing receipts and income under war conditions, yet there is trustworthy evidence that Edington was a sound financier and a capable, though unpopular, official.

The troubles which, under Edward I., had led to the wardrobe taking the place of the exchequer, resulted, under Edward III., in the wardrobe becoming more and more completely under

¹ *E.A.* 390/6 gives Master Paul of Montefiore's audited account for their deliverance. The exchequer paid £24,834 : 6 : 0 on this account. The privy seal directing this issue was dated April 26, 1344.

² *M.B.E.* 204/84d. The sum of the clerks' expenses was 5s. a day.

³ *Ib.* 204/4. "Hunc librum liberauit hic predictus Ricardus de Eccleshale locum tenens contrarotulorum predictorum, xx^o die Januarii anno regis xviii^o, et Willelmus de Broklesby, baro, illum recepit."

⁴ *Ib.* ff. 15-20 show how illusory is the statement quoted in the preceding note.

⁵ See above, ii. 91-93.

exchequer control. We shall soon see that the function of the wardrobe in later wars was much more that of a treasury with the army in the field, firmly controlled by the home treasury of the exchequer, than that of an independent and self-contained office of finance, the rival, if not the master, of the financial office at home. That the preponderating influence was, henceforth, to be that of the exchequer was, perhaps, in no small measure, due to Edington. His long treasurership, covering nearly the whole of the most acute and brilliant period of the war, is a remarkable illustration of the regularisation of administrative machinery which distinguished the middle years of Edward III.'s reign. We know that it was during Edington's treasurership that the chamber definitely ceased to be a rival of the exchequer; but first of all there was secured for the exchequer a strongly marked superiority over the wardrobe. This process was assisted by the virtual cessation of the old struggle between the political and domestic administrators which had come to a head in 1341. The wardrobe was, in future, chiefly important abroad, when it was still the war treasury. When at home, it was largely a court office, mainly concerned with household expenditure.

Even abroad the wardrobe represented only the king's personal contribution to the expenses of a campaign. His magnates, who had become his partners in the enterprise, each had their own household accounts and their own budgets. Campaigns not waged by the king in person hardly came into wardrobe accounts at all. Had the household accounts of the Black Prince, or of John of Gaunt, survived as fully as those of their father, we should be in a better position to estimate the real cost to the nation of the French campaigns waged by these agents of the English power in France. The demand that the king should live and fight "of his own" becomes more intelligible, when we reflect that the barons were expected to do their share of the fighting on their own responsibility. They naturally claimed some control over a joint-stock enterprise and looked for a reasonable chance of recouping themselves. The financial independence which was thus procured for the magnate leaders of English armies throws a strong light on the efficiency of parliamentary control of war expenditure. In short, the system of household control which, under Edward I., had barely sufficed to finance wars on a small

scale, largely waged in Britain, proved altogether inadequate for the administration of the great continental campaigns of the Hundred Years' War.

A natural consequence of these developments was that Edington's successors in the wardrobe retained control over their offices for longer periods than had lately been customary. The first to enjoy this advantage was Wetwang, who, as we have already seen, on Edington's promotion, was raised to the keepership of the wardrobe. He began to account for the wardrobe from April 11, 1344, and his term of office was only ended by his death, more than three and a half years later, on November 24, 1347. For the whole of this time William Dalton, who had already had over six years' experience as cofferer, acted as his controller.¹ Richard Eccleshall, who was bearing the brunt of the long-drawn-out arrayment of Edington's account, took Dalton's place as cofferer.

The accident of the prolonged Crécy-Calais campaign soon gave a special prominence to a fourth official, William Retford, who had been, since 1341, clerk of the kitchen and allied offices,² and to other household clerks who attended Edward abroad. Among these were Master Michael Northburgh, a "mighty clerk, one of the king's councillors," and a few years later keeper of the privy seal;³ and Richard Winkley, Dominican friar and the king's confessor. Thomas Bradwardine, the future archbishop of Canterbury, though a saint and academically famous as the "profound doctor," was also with the king as one of his household clerks.⁴ Nor must we forget the bannerets and knights of the household, who, besides their proper military duties, co-operated with the clerks in secretarial and administrative work. Among them may be pointed out

¹ For Dalton's early career see above, pp. 104, 106. For his subsequent career and family concerns see later, pp. 130-131, especially n. 7.

² Retford was already clerk of the kitchen in the winter 1341-42; *M.B.E.* 204/178.

³ "Valens clericus, unus de consiliariis domini regis"; Avesbury, p. 357. For his letter see *ib.* pp. 358-360. He had been on May 10, 1346, "engaged to be of the king's council," receiving his robes and his fee of 100 marks a year when beyond the seas, and 50 marks when in England; *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 80. It was dated the same day as the similar appointment of the veteran privy seal clerk, John Carlton.

⁴ Murimuth, pp. 201-202. He was one of the clerks appointed in Oct. 1346 to treat of peace with the French; *Foedera*, iii. 92. But he was not, as Birchington says, the king's confessor; *Anglia Sacra*, i. 42.

Richard Talbot, the steward ; John Darcy, the chamberlain, and his successor, Bartholomew Burghersh.¹ Burghersh was prominent among the literate knights who vied with the clerks in compiling the well-known despatches which told stay-at-home Englishmen the story of the deeds of their king and his army. The intelligence and publicity departments of the Crécy army were, like its administrative offices, in advance of the times. The result was that the chroniclers were able to enliven their narratives, not only with contemporary correspondence, but also, upon occasion, with official documents of great value.

We are fortunate in having two detailed wardrobe accounts which include the whole of the Crécy-Calais campaign. One of these is Wetwang's book of receipts for the whole period of his office.² This book, of over a hundred pages, gives wardrobe income with singular particularity, especially during the long absence of the wardrobe abroad. Unhappily, it gives us only a scanty summary of wardrobe expenses. We learn, however, that these expenses were as meticulously recorded as were the receipts, and that the organisation of the household had advanced so far that separate books were assigned for setting forth the particulars of the expenses of the *hospicium*, the *prestita* and the foreign expenses. Also we have, besides the summarised enrolment of Wetwang's accounts as a whole,³ a record of the debts of Wetwang after the end of his term,⁴ and, above all, the elaborate "kitchen journal" of Retford, which covers nearly the whole of Wetwang's keepership and illustrates in detail the cost of the office of which Retford was chief.⁵ From these various sources we can study

¹ *Ib.* pp. 202-204. He was chamberlain before Sept. 14, 1347.

² *E.A.* 390/12, a book of 104 pages. It was delivered in the exchequer on Nov. 27, 1349, by Eccleshall, attorney and executor of Wetwang. It is partly summarised in Wrottesley's *Crécy and Calais*. For an account of Wetwang, for wages of war of the retinue of Edward in Normandy, France and Calais from June 4, 1346, to Oct. 12, 1347, amounting to £127,201 : 2 : 9, see Ramsay, *Genesis of Lancaster*, i. 352, and Brady, *Hist. of England*, ii. 86, where it is printed.

³ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* No. 2, m. 41.

⁴ "Debita Wetwang"; *E.A.* 301/9.

⁵ *E.A.* 390/11. This is a vast roll of 95 membranes, beautifully written out, one of the most attractive of surviving wardrobe accounts. It consists of membranes sewn together after the so-called "chancery pattern." But the receipt and issue rolls show that this method of making up was not peculiar to the chancery. Its value for the history of the campaign is well recognised, notably by Sir E. Maunde Thompson. See his notes, especially pp. 252-257, to his *Chronicon Galfridi le Baker*. It affords a complete itinerary of the offices of the kitchen, and therefore more or less that of the king and his immediate following.

adequately the part played by the wardrobe in these memorable years. No doubt these wardrobe records as they stand were drawn up at leisure, after the return of the wardrobe to England; but the material for their sections relevant to the war must have been collected as the army worked its way uneasily, stage by stage, from La Hougue to Calais, or lay camped in wooden huts in the marshes encircling the beleaguered city.¹ Cut off for long periods from all communications with its base, the wardrobe was necessarily self-sufficient in all respects until the long siege of Calais enabled the king to set up in his camp a "temporary capital," not too far removed from Westminster.

The whole of Wetwang's receipt for the 1323 days of his account, more than three years and a half, amounted to £226,212 : 8 : 8 $\frac{3}{4}$. Of this, £178,752 : 16 : 1 came from the exchequer of receipt,² £38,940 : 4 : 9 from the exchequer of accounts, and £8519 : 7 : 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ only were foreign receipt, strictly so-called, though the "particulars" of the account describe as foreign the whole £47,459 : 12 : 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ derived elsewhere than from the exchequer of receipt. The sum provided by the exchequer of accounts included the £32,129 : 1 : 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ which were transferred by Robert Burton, receiver of the chamber, from the chamber receipt, earmarked for the wages of soldiers and other divers payments.³ It also recorded, among the *recepta garderobe* at the exchequer of accounts, certain payments from Bramber, another receiver of the chamber, and other payments from the king's butler for wine, from the constable of Bordeaux, from Thoresby, from the hanaper office of which, as keeper of the great seal

¹ I can find no evidence in the wardrobe records of the fire which, according to *Chron. de Melsa*, iii. 65-66, destroyed the greater part of the wardrobe and many arms of war off Calais: "apud Calesiam flamma ferox ignis casualiter succensi maximam partem garderobe regis Edwardi et arma bellica varia deuorauit." "Garderoba regis" may signify the itinerant privy wardrobe of the household, but a disaster which involved no proved loss is not likely to have been serious. See below, pp. 482-483; and compare above (p. 106, n. 1) for an uncorroborated story of 1340.

² *E.A.* 390/12, f. 88. On one writ of liberate for £100,000!

³ *Ib.* f. 83. Compare also *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)*, 2/41. The sum was "onerata super eundem custodem ad scaccarium compotorum." This is the usual formula. See also *E.A.* 391/4: "Et Waltero de Wetewang, custodi garderobe regis, super vadiis hominum ad arma, hobelarium, sagittarium, Wallensium et aliis diversis solutionibus per vices faciendis, £32,129 : 1 : 8 $\frac{1}{2}$." See also later, pp. 290-291.

abroad, Thoresby had control, and from Edington for the price of victuals purchased when he was keeper.¹

Clearly the wardrobe got money from whatsoever source it could, and the chamber was at this period of foreign campaigning little more than a channel for collecting money for war expenses. Most of the wardrobe's "receipt" passed through the exchequer, whether that of accounts or that of receipt. Moreover, many of the sums recorded as wardrobe issues, for instance for wages, were not paid directly by the wardrobe. The system of the early Netherlandish campaigns was now more fully consolidated. All that the wardrobe usually did, especially with wages of war and peace, was to give its employee a "bill of the keeper," which he caused to be presented to the exchequer, so that the exchequer really paid. In the same way "wardrobe receipt," whether from the exchequer or not, was not often receipt in cash. Such "receipts" and "issues" of the wardrobe were technical, book-keeping records of transactions actually carried out by other bodies or individuals.

We must note besides, that even in such a strenuous time as 1344-47 the aggregate sum of wardrobe receipt was small in comparison with that of 1338-40. In the earlier period, Norwell received over £262,721 in less than two years. Now, in more than three and a half years, Wetwang received only £226,212. Thus, while Norwell received over £140,000 a year, Wetwang received no more than about £65,000 a year. Apart from the actual amount, there was also another main difference. Norwell only received £108,759 from the exchequer, and about £153,962 from other sources, largely taxes, especially those on wool, levied in Flanders and Brabant. The rigorous exchequer control now established leaps to the eye. It was the natural result of the collapse of household independence before baronial and parliamentary control.

From another point of view Wetwang's figures show a sounder system of war finance than those of Norwell. Norwell overspent his receipts by almost £18,000, and his *prestita* amounted to nearly £117,000 as well. Thus, his ultimate responsibility for issues was no less than £410,292 : 4 : 4 $\frac{3}{4}$.² Now Wetwang's expenses only amounted to £242,162 : 15 : 0 $\frac{3}{4}$, including *prestita* of not more

¹ *E.A.* 390/12, ff. 72-88.

² See above, pp. 104-106.

than £13,629:11:0½.¹ Wetwang, therefore, overspent his income by some £16,000 only, a sum corroborated by the later statement of the wardrobe debt of his period.² The successful Crécy-Calais campaign, including the greatest victory of the period and the longest and most costly siege, carried on by the largest force ever raised by Edward III., was then less burdensome to English finance than the futile proceedings of the Netherlandish period, so barren in feats of arms and in concrete results. The inference is that it was cheaper and safer for Englishmen to fight their own battles than to work through greedy and self-seeking foreign allies.

An analysis of Wetwang's expenses shows that war charges were still the main reason for wardrobe expenditure. The *hospicium*, however, was also more costly under the special conditions of the period, requiring £45,001:1:1½, as against £23,746:1:8½ for the shorter period for which Norwell was responsible. "Foreign expenses," on the contrary, were much lower, £183,532:2:10¾ as against £269,595:12:1. Of these Wetwang's chief item was *vadia guerre* £149,991:14:11½, to which that of *municio ville de Caleys*, £1027:10:8, may well be added. The other "foreign" items were more moderate, the most costly being *necessaria* at £11,469:1:8¼, and *dona* at £15,581:5:5½. The modest charges of £451:0:3 for *elemosina*, and £94:8:10½ for *nuncii*, indicate severe economy in those obligations. The only problems which suggest themselves are connected with the proportion which these war charges bore to the whole cost of the campaigns, and the amount of advances or loans which was left over. It is symptomatic of the growing restriction on wardrobe activity that there is so much less to be gleaned from the records in these relations than can be gathered from the same source about wardrobe transactions during the Netherlandish period.

Wetwang's activity was cut short by his death on November 24, 1347, within six weeks of the king's return to England³ and

¹ *E.A.* 390/12, f. 89.

² *Ib.* 301/9, f. 92, which gives "summa omnium debitorum de tempore dicti custodis" as £16,105:13:5¾. The debts were mainly for "vadia guerre" supplies, and "hospicium" expenses still unliquidated.

³ *Ib.* 390/11. The passage to Dover was on Oct. 12. On Oct. 13 the household was at Canterbury and on Oct. 14 at Westminster, where it remained till Oct. 21, when Retford's itinerary terminates.

the resumption of normal home conditions. His executors, three Yorkshire clerks like himself, got his cofferer Eccleshall to act on their behalf.¹ Eccleshall was able to present the accounts to the exchequer within a year.²

The next keeper of the wardrobe was Thomas Clopton, whose account ranged from November 24, 1347, to July 5, 1349. For all this period and beyond it, William Dalton, Wetwang's controller, remained in office, and Eccleshall seems to have continued as cofferer.³ Why Clopton passed over the heads of these experienced officers is something of a mystery, but it may be accounted for by his kinship with the powerful Northburgh family. He belonged to a Suffolk family, several members of which served Edward III. as clerks or knights, and had been king's clerk as early as 1331,⁴ but I have found no evidence that he had ever been employed in the wardrobe.⁵ He had acted as taxer of the ninth in Staffordshire in 1340, and held property in that county. As a canon of Lichfield, he had been employed to seize the benefices of non-resident aliens and to visit and reform certain religious houses in that diocese.⁶ He received his highest ecclesiastical preferment after his retirement from the administration. This was the deanery of Wimborne, to which he was appointed in January 1349.⁷ Soon afterwards he died, before

¹ Eccleshall was not new to this work. He had been Norwell's attorney in presenting that officer's great wardrobe account for Apr. 1, 1335, to Michaelmas 1336; *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/5, 6, 7. Eccleshall apparently owed to Norwell his position in the wardrobe of the household.

² *E.A.* 390/12. As usual, receipts were booked long after this date, the last entries being Michaelmas term, 1349-50, that is, up to the verge of Easter in the latter year. But, unlike the previous account, the serious receipt was completed within the term in which the account terminated. Only about £10,000 were entered after Michaelmas term, 1348-49; *ib.* ff. 66, 69, 71.

³ He was called "late cofferer" in Aug. 1349, but he presented Clopton's account and probably continued in office till Clopton's death; *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 391.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 40, records an exchange of benefices with Simon Clopton, also a king's clerk, on Jan. 14, 1331. Thomas had only been presented to the living a month earlier; *ib.* p. 25.

⁵ I feel confident that he was not a wardrobe clerk up to 1344, but the records of Wetwang's keepership are so imperfect that it is hard to be sure as to the wardrobe staff between 1344 and 1347.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 86; *ib.*, 1338-40, p. 306; *ib.*, 1340-43, pp. 26, 306. *C.F.R.* v. 464.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 251. This is dated Jan. 31, but *ib.* p. 303 records the presentation of Wimborne to his successor on June 17. He must have died therefore between these two dates.

the delivery of his account, so that it had to be presented by the indispensable Eccleshall on behalf of his heir, Hugh of Northburgh.¹ The responsibility for the wardrobe remained with Dalton and Eccleshall until July 5, when a new keeper was appointed.

Clopton's account covered about one year and eight months, and was on a very restricted scale as compared with those of his immediate predecessors. We must go back to 1333-34 before we can find figures even approaching his in their moderation. The whole receipt only reached £22,396 : 4 : 0 $\frac{1}{4}$, of which £18,648 : 12 : 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ was from the exchequer of receipt, £2483 : 14 : 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ from the exchequer of accounts, and £1263 : 16 : 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ was "foreign receipt." The disbursements showed equal thrift. The *hospicium* demanded only £17,475 : 15 : 7 $\frac{3}{4}$, and the one strictly military charge was the pay, amounting to £827 : 0 : 1 $\frac{1}{2}$, for archers at Sandwich, in the king's service for war. The sum of expenses amounted to £24,008 : 0 : 4 $\frac{3}{4}$, to which *prestita*, totalling £1918 : 15 : 5 $\frac{1}{2}$, were added, reaching in all, £25,925 : 15 : 10 $\frac{1}{4}$, an excess of disbursements in proportion to receipts almost as great as in the preceding accounts. It is satisfactory to know that Simon Clopton, Thomas' brother and immediate heir, had levied the greater part of his brother's debt before his own decease in the early summer of 1349.² Then the estate went to the next heir, Hugh Northburgh.

One novelty only characterised Clopton's tenure of office. That was the renewal of the old policy of facilitating the king's capacity to live "of his own," by assigning to the service of the household certain lands of minors temporarily in royal custody. The method adopted was to lease them to the keeper of the wardrobe in return for a rent payable at the wardrobe. On November 28, 1348, the king granted to keeper Clopton two-

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/42: "Compotus Thome de Clopton, nuper custodis garderober regis defuncti, Hugonis de Northburgh, heredis et tenentis terrarum et tenementorum que fuerunt ipsius Thome, pro eodem defuncto, Ricardi de Eccleshale attornati Hugonis pro eodem Hugone." The account was tendered to the exchequer before Aug. 31, 1349; *C.P.R., 1348-49*, p. 391. This was well within two months of the termination of the account, and is a record for quickness.

² *C.P.R., 1348-50*, p. 391. By July 9 Simon was already dead, and it was recorded on Aug. 31 that he had levied most of the debt, though "the sum had not been answered to the king," who seized Thomas' goods in Staffordshire as security.

thirds of the lands of Laurence Hastings, late earl of Pembroke. The lands were to be held by him and his successors in that office until the lawful age of the heir,¹ they tendering yearly to the wardrobe for the expenses of the king's household, £733 : 6 : 8, at Whitsunday and Martinmas in equal portions, besides paying a further sum to the widow of the deceased earl.² Thus a palatine earldom was definitely appropriated to provide for the upkeep of the household, otherwise than from the exchequer. It was significant that the grant went to the wardrobe and not, as a few years earlier one would have expected, to the chamber. With the declension of the chamber, the wardrobe had some chance of regaining a measure of financial independence.³

The responsibility imposed upon Clopton was so great that he sublet part of the estate to others. His chief lessee was Richard Talbot, the veteran steward of the household, who was given charge of the Pembrokeshire lands and castles on condition of his rendering to the keeper of the wardrobe £320 a year, payable on the morrow of the Ascension and All Souls, in equal portions "in the wardrobe, or if the king were without the realm, in the church of St. Paul's, London."⁴ Talbot was to hold the "county of Pembroke" as "fully as the earl held of the king." His lease was still running in 1350 when, on April 20, the rent was reduced

¹ Earl Laurence died on Aug. 30, 1348, of the Black Death, and his son John had been born only in the previous year. The period of the grant might well approach twenty years. John was the earl of Pembroke of 1371-75. See above, iii. pp. 266-267, 270.

² *C.F.R.* vi. 100-101. The estate was so extensive that it was necessary to send mandates of livery to twelve escheators, responsible for seventeen shires in England, besides one to the escheator of Herefordshire and "the March of Wales adjacent," to deliver to him Pembroke and Tenby castles and towns and the other portions of the Pembrokeshire palatinate included within the grant.

³ See for this later, pp. 302-303.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 252, dated Jan. 27, 1349. The keeper had power of re-entry if the rent were not paid punctually. Three similar leases, dated Jan 5, 1349, were inspected and confirmed by patent on Jan. 20. The aggregate of the rents was £53 : 6 : 8, and there were the same provisions as to place of payment and right of re-entry; *ib.* pp. 226-227. Another lease to Guy Brian was annulled because Brian never intermeddled with the manors; *ib.* p. 324. The sublease to Talbot is a good instance of that co-operation between the steward and the keeper in the joint administration of the household to which I have referred more than once. The military charge of the castles and franchises went to the knightly steward, while the administration of the rest went to the clerical keeper. The assumption that the wardrobe was likely to be beyond seas from time to time is interesting, as is the selection of St. Paul's cathedral as the place for wardrobe receipt when the office was beyond sea.

to £240 because the value of the franchise had been "so deteriorated by the deadly pestilence which lately raged in those parts that he will be unable to answer for the whole ferm without grave loss."¹ The Black Death was at its height in London when Clopton and his brother died, and although we have no definite information as to the cause of their decease, it is not impossible that they were victims of the plague.

Clopton's successor was William Cusance, whose long administrative career we have already traced since the time when he was the younger Despenser's favourite clerk.² It is strange that the man who had preceded Edington as treasurer of the exchequer should, in his old age, take up once more the post which he had surrendered in 1341 in order to fill the more dignified office. Cusance's second keepership lasted from July 5, 1349, to February 14, 1350, only.³ Yet it was no stopgap appointment, for it is clear that the energy he had shown at the wardrobe between 1340 and 1341 had not now deserted him.⁴ It is equally clear that he co-operated on the closest terms with Edington, and probable that he was, to some extent, the tool of the masterful treasurer. This association is the more significant because it was in Cusance's time that the device of assigning wardships to the wardrobe for the support of the household, attempted experimentally under Clopton, was erected into a general policy. As the most important wardrobe innovation of the period, and as possibly indicative of a desire to arrest the steady degradation of the wardrobe's position, it demands from us particular attention. Though only initiated in the brief seven months of Cusance's co-operation with Edington, it determined the course of wardrobe history until experience had demonstrated its failure.

A letter, written soon after Cusance's accession to office, reveals that the king had resolved to adopt, as a settled policy, the reservation of all valuable wardships and marriages which fell into the royal hands, to the treasurer of the wardrobe to meet the expenses of the household. The wardrobe officers were

¹ *C.F.R.* vi. 240. A similar instance of reduction of ferm is on *ib.* pp. 73, 244.

² See above, p. 72, and the references on *ib.* n. 4.

³ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/1.

⁴ Cusance was alive in 1358, but dead in 1360; *C. Pap. Reg. Pet.* i. 333, 357, 359.

not, however, at first clearly informed of what constituted a valuable wardship, and were, therefore, somewhat vague as to which lands were covered by this provision. A letter, written probably by William Dalton, controller to both Clopton and Cusance, has been accidentally preserved. It throws a flood of light on the situation and on the difficulties involved in administering the royal mandate.¹ The suggestion made was that a fixed commission of three household officers should visit the shires and report on the true value of the estates fallen to minors,

¹ This letter is in *A.C.* xl. 100, and its importance suggests the desirability of printing it in full : "Sire . . . purce qe le roi est assentuz qe toutz les gardes et mariages qe sont de value, et qe ore sont escheu ou escherront, ensemblement oue gardes qe escherront, garde dengarde, soient reseruez et assignez au tresorer de la garderobe pur les despences de son hostiel, qe pur le temps serra, a la veraie value. Et purce qe sire William de Cusance ore tresorer de la dite garderobe, ne moi, ne susmes pas ore pleinement enforme queux terres sont escheux ne de quele value eles sont, susmes acordez par commun assent et pur le profit le roi, qe commissions soient faitez, ioyntement et severallment, a sire Johan de Aumpleford, clerc del marche del hostiel le roi, et William de Blankeneye et a William Croyser, de alier de ver les counteez la ou tieles terres sont escheuz denquere et sercher la veraie value dicelles, et de reporter a nous la informacion, au fin, qe le dit sire William purreit estre charge, come tresorer de la garderobe, de mesme la value, et qe les commissions soient qils peussent sesier les manoirs et y mettre ministres et ent ordiner pur le profit le roi, et qe briefs soient faitz as viscontes come eschetours destre entendantz as susnomeez.

"Et sire vous plese, estre graciosus consailant et aidant au dit sire William de Cusance es busoignes qil auera affaire deuers vous touchant la denee de seint Martyn soulent le porport des lettres queles nostre seigneur le roi vous envoie pur luy."

The letter is endorsed : "Al honorable pierre en Dieu leuesqz de seint David, chancellier nostre seigneur le roi."

Internal evidence enables us to fix date and authorship of this letter within narrow limits. The address to Thoresby shows it was written after June 19, 1349, when Thoresby became chancellor and before his translation from St. Davids to Worcester, made by papal provision on Sept. 9, was known in England. The reference to Cusance as treasurer of the wardrobe shows it was written after July 5. As a particular commission to ascertain the extent and resources of one estate was issued to the three persons mentioned in the letter on Aug. 10 (*C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 388), it is possible that this was the outcome of the letter's suggestions. If so, the letter was written between July 5 and Aug. 10. It is not, however, certain, for the writer may simply have expressed the wish that such particular commissions as that of Aug. 10 might be changed into a general commission of inquiry. Again, the suggestion in the last clause that Thoresby should help Cusance in business relating to the deanery of St. Martins-le-Grand, to which he had been presented on June 19 (*ib.* p. 305), may have evoked the letter patent of Oct. 27 (*ib.* p. 457) prohibiting ecclesiastical persons from proceeding in derogation to Cusance's rights as dean. It was, therefore, clearly written by October, and it was then that the wholesale assignation of wardships to the wardrobe began. The whole letter shows the intimate association of Thoresby as well as Edington with the new policy and the anxiety of the wardrobe officers to carry out the wishes of chancellor and treasurer.

with a view to suggesting which were appropriate for wardrobe administration. A few such inquiries were made, but the special commission was apparently soon found unnecessary, and, before the end of Cusance's keepership, numerous wardships and marriages had been definitely handed over to the wardrobe.

In August the question was still not settled. Though on August 10 the wardship of certain Beaumont lands was already definitely "reserved for the expenses of the household" so that the commission of three were appointed to ascertain their value,¹ it was still doubtful on August 22 whether the earl of Arundel's rent for that wardship was to be rendered at the exchequer or at the wardrobe, and the decision was left to be "agreed on" between Edington, Cusance and the earl.² Not until October 14 was the wardship finally given to Arundel and his wife jointly, "rendering yearly in the wardrobe to the keeper thereof, £300," in two equal portions.³ This same month of October saw an immense extension of the system, and from that time until the end of 1350, the reservations of wardships and marriages to the wardrobe were too numerous to particularise.⁴ Many of them were of small estates of trifling value; but in nearly every case the wardships and the "marriage" were separately assessed on figures which suggest that the latter was the more lucrative possession. The stream became thin with the beginning of 1351, and henceforth such reservation was, almost, but not quite, limited to small estates. All along the assignments were not made exclusively to the wardrobe; reservations of wardships to chamber and exchequer occur side by side with them. There are even cases where the responsibility for the estate was divided between the wardrobe and the

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 388. This is the only enrolled instance of the commission of three acting, and even here the decision to reserve the wardship for household expenses had been already taken before the commission was appointed. There are other instances of Ampleforth, clerk of the market, acting alone; for instance, *ib.* p. 450.

² *C.F.R.* vi. 161.

³ *Ib.* p. 173. The countess of Arundel was the mother, by her first husband, of the infant heir. Hence Arundel's wardship.

⁴ The majority of these grants are enrolled on the fine roll. See, for instance, *C.F.R.* vi. pp. 174, 176, 180, 183, 185, 189, 200, 246, 247, 256-260. Yet the baffling way in which some enrolments relating to these lands are found in the close and patents rolls adds to the labour of the minute investigator. He is thankful for the excellent subject indexes to vols. vi. and vii. of the fine rolls, which collect conveniently the chief instances. Unluckily, all the calendars are not made equally accessible by such helps.

exchequer.¹ Some administrative confusion may well have ensued from this flow of small sums into different offices, and it was, perhaps, to lessen this that the formula "at the exchequer or elsewhere by king's order" was occasionally employed.² In 1349 and in 1353 the king's reiterated reservation to the chamber of all escheats and forfeitures prevented any extension of wardrobe responsibility beyond the category of wardships and marriages.³ This distinction may indicate a policy underlying the stream of confusing mandates emanating from chancery in those years; but rigid adherence to any definite principle is still sadly to seek. The obvious result of the new system was increased administrative confusion.

Rents and marriage fines paid in at fixed periods doubtless did something to relieve the embarrassments of the wardrobe, but amounts were mostly so small that they could make little real difference to wardrobe resources. If salvation was to come from this quarter, it could only be by appropriation of great estates. The wardrobe was perhaps lucky in that several considerable inheritances now fell to wards in royal custody. Mention has already been made of the two-thirds of the Hastings inheritance which formed the first of the estates so reserved. It remained under wardrobe control for something approaching ten years, but underwent changes in its custody which tended to weaken the link binding it to the wardrobe, and to reduce the amount of its ferm. Richard Talbot surrendered his ferm in 1351, and with him disappeared the special obligation to the keeper which made him in 1348 a sub-tenant of Clopton. In Cusance's days, and later, the chief responsibility imposed upon the keeper was the collection of the ferm, and before long even the formula of reservation for the expenses of the household disappeared naturally, since the upkeep of the household was, in these years, the main obligation the wardrobe had to meet. The re-grant of the Hastings estate in 1351 was to the boy heir's mother and her new husband, John Hakelut, but the rent, which had been £733 : 6 : 8 in 1348, was now reduced to £320, £240,

¹ See, for instance, *C.F.R.* vi. 244-245, where John Charnels had to pay 20 marks to the wardrobe and 5 m. to the exchequer for a wardship, while the whole of a marriage "farm," valued at £100, was to be paid at the receipt of the exchequer.

² For instance, *ib.* vi. 245 on July 1, 1350. Compare below, p. 247.

³ See later, pp. 243-244.

and £200, successively.¹ In 1353 Hakelut and the countess received the keeping of other parts of the Hastings estate for a rent payable, not to the wardrobe but to the chamber.² In 1357 the countess, who had now lost her second husband, received a new grant of the original estates at the reduced ferm of £160, and this is spoken of as bound to be rendered "at the exchequer or in the wardrobe."³ Thus the solid consideration and the tie to the wardrobe were whittled down into insignificance, long before the heir came of age.

Still greater things should have come to the wardrobe from the wardship of the Despenser lands than from that of the Hastings estates. Hugh Despenser, lord of Glamorgan, died on February 8, 1349.⁴ The custody of his estates and heir were assigned to Bartholomew Burghersh, who had now succeeded Talbot as king's chamberlain. With him was associated the heir himself, Edward Despenser, then a youth of fourteen, and the pair were to pay for their custody £1000 a year into the wardrobe in quarterly instalments.⁵ Three years later Burghersh voluntarily surrendered two-thirds of the estate to the joint custody of the heir and his mother, who made themselves responsible for the whole ferm.⁶ This custody came to a natural termination in 1357, having been perhaps more clearly advantageous to the material interest of Burghersh than to that of Despenser, the more so as Despenser married Burghersh's daughter.

After 1351 the experiment of the reservation of lands for the wardrobe was slowly abandoned. The old arrangements were generally allowed to work out their natural course and to terminate when the heirs came of age, but few new "leases" were made, and those, if not mere renewals of older arrangements, were mainly of insignificant amount. Yet so late as 1357 another

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1350-54, pp. 199; *C.F.R.* vi. 317, 432-433.

² *C.F.R.* vi. 367.

³ *Ib.* vii. 33.

⁴ *Cal. Inq.* ix. 328-342 enumerates his lands and property.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 296, shows that Burghersh had custody of both heir and estate before May 15, 1349; *C.F.R.* iv. 208, gives the grant, dated Feb. 6, 1350, subject to the £1000 rent. It seems curious to put a minor under his own custody, even when so near maturity as young Despenser. But *Cal. Inq.* x. 285, makes it certain that Burghersh's associate was the heir and not another Edward Despenser, otherwise unknown.

⁶ *C.F.R.* vi. 378-379. Edward was born on Mar. 24, 1336; *Cal. Inq.* x. 285. *Ib.* viii. 266, is therefore a day wrong. He was over seventeen at the date of this grant on Sept. 27, 1353.

considerable wardrobe rent was imposed, the estate concerned being that of Thomas Lisle, the recalcitrant bishop of Ely, driven into exile by his quarrel with the king. In February 1357 John Wesenham, the great Lynn merchant, received the Ely temporalities, as from the octaves of Michaelmas 1356, on condition that he rendered in the king's wardrobe for such custody, 3740 marks for the current year, and for each subsequent year 3000 marks. This contract was maintained until the octave of Michaelmas 1361,¹ when it expired, and with it the system of which it had been a belated representative.

It is easy to see why the experiment failed. Like the experiment of chamber manors, it did not bring the expected financial relief, and there was, therefore, no reason for its continuance. Neither Cusance nor any of his immediate successors found that these farms, payable to the wardrobe, helped materially to balance the wardrobe accounts or swell the modest total of the wardrobe receipts. Only by increased exchequer grants, that is, by increased taxation, could the king maintain the state. Whatever profit came from the experiment went, not to the king, but to the lessees of the wardrobe lands. In its original conception, when the keeper of the wardrobe himself was to undertake the responsibility of custody, the plan died in 1349 when Clopton's responsibility was transferred to lessees under him. All subsequent wardrobe rents were administered by the lessees, and all that the wardrobe did was to receive the money, which seldom came in a continuous stream. The economic dislocation produced by the Black Death not only involved big reductions of the farms, but in all probability threw the lessees into arrears even with their reduced payments.

The lessees thus found less profit from their grants than they had anticipated, but the eagerness with which they were sought suggests that they were still beneficial to their recipients. Not every one, like the chamberlains Talbot and Burghersh, had the temporary management of a big estate, and still fewer, like Burghersh, found in their wards wealthy husbands for their

¹ The indenture, dated Feb. 1, 1357, is enrolled on the dorse of the close roll; *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 392. It was modified by the commitment, dated Feb. 14 (*C.R.F.* vii. 28), and the rent for succeeding years was reduced to 3000 m.; *ib.* p. 172. On June 30, 1361, after the bishop's death, it was renewed until the octave of Michaelmas; *ib.* p. 172.

daughters. But, great and small, all servants of the crown welcomed in these grants some compensation for salaries and allowances constantly in arrears, and we may almost measure the favour which king's clerks received from their sovereign by the number and amount of the wardrobe leases vouchsafed to them.¹

A broader problem arises. Had the departure been a deliberate stroke of policy or merely an opportunistic experiment, easily embarked upon and lightly abandoned? In favour of the broader view is the coincidence of this change with the reforms in the exchequer and chamber which we have studied or shall have to study elsewhere. There is an irresistible temptation to connect the trial and failure of wardrobe manors with the trial and failure of the chamber lands. But there is no sign of such friction between exchequer and wardrobe as undoubtedly hastened the end of the chamber estate. On the contrary, there is clear evidence that the wardrobe experiment was the result of the cordial co-operation of chancery, exchequer and wardrobe. We have seen how Cusance worked in close connection with Thoresby and with Edington, and how he or his subordinates consulted them by correspondence.² On many occasions the old wardrobe keeper made it a point to appear personally in chancery to testify to his receiving the wardrobe ferm in due course.³ Noteworthy too is the fact that a large proportion, perhaps a majority, of the writs of assignment of wardrobe leases were warranted "by bill of the treasurer," a course involving exchequer goodwill. The very appointment of an ex-treasurer of the exchequer to carry out the policy speaks for itself. A more profound study of the inter-departmental relations at this time, than can be

¹ Among the lessees of wardrobe lands recorded in *C.F.R.* vi. are the following king's servants, mostly clerks: David Wooler (p. 314), J. Winwick (pp. 189, 233), William Newnham (*ib.* 205), Richard Watt (p. 231), William Dalton (pp. 230, 240), J. Charnels (p. 244), H. Walton (p. 337), W. Rothwell (p. 381), Helming Leget (p. 65), J. Ampleforth (p. 208), Roger Chesterfield (p. 247), William Farley (p. 256). Others could easily be added.

² See above, pp. 122-124.

³ See, for instance, *C.F.R.* vi. 176: "Be it remembered that William de Cusance, treasurer of the wardrobe, came personally into chancery at Westminster on Nov. 12 and acknowledged the receipt of the said £100." Compare p. 179 for a similar appearance on Feb. 4, 1349. Compare *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 450, an order to farm out wardrobe manors "by the testimony of William, bishop of Winchester, the treasurer, and William Cusance, keeper of the wardrobe."

attempted here, might well prove that the constant strivings after administrative reform at this period were the conscious result of efforts to secure co-ordination between the various offices of state, such efforts as we shall find later associated with Edington and some of his successors at the treasury.

Yet this suggestion must not be pressed so far as to exclude the more opportunistic view. The concurrent blows of costly unfruitful warfare, and of the economic dislocation of the Black Death, had reduced the finances of the realm to such disorder, that any desperate measure to make both ends meet might well be seized upon, and naturally, when found useless, would be abandoned. It was something to pay off old debts by new and easy assignments, to decrease the mass of *prestita*, to content officers who could not be paid their salaries, or magnates whose goodwill was worth purchasing. Perhaps expedients of this description sometimes involved results more valuable and permanent. Anyhow, the financial reforms of the early sixties, following hard upon these wardrobe and chamber experiments of the early fifties, did something to lessen the chaos of the administrative system and to produce that closer co-ordination of departments which is the best proof of administrative progress under Edward III. From the special point of view of the wardrobe, the failure of the last attempt to assign to it a new rôle, or rather to revive, on its behalf, devices already tried earlier in the century, left the wardrobe to sink back into a modest position. From this position it emerged only when war, conducted by the king in person, called upon it to take once again the great share in war administration which had been its lot earlier. As in similar circumstances touching the chamber, the exchequer undertook the work the wardrobe had failed to carry through.

To avoid breaking the thread of the story, it was perhaps necessary to work out to the end the fate of the experiment, initiated in Cusance's reign, of supplementing the resources of the wardrobe by the appropriation of the funds, obtained from the wardships and marriages of royal wards, to the support of the king's household. We must now resume our history of the wardrobe, keeper by keeper. The seven months of Cusance's keepership hardly gave an opportunity to show any great results from the new departure, and the modest figures of Clopton's

account were capped by the still smaller figures of his successor. In the few months Cusance was in charge, the wardrobe receipt was but £6921 : 9 : 10, and of this £1324 : 19 : 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ was "foreign receipt," of which all, except £80 : 2 : 11 $\frac{3}{4}$, came from wardships and marriages. Against this must be set *hospicium* expenses amounting to no more than £6810 : 6 : 10 $\frac{1}{2}$,¹ so that, small as it was, the foreign receipt made for solvency. Since Wetwang's time, another change had also crept into the wardrobe receipt. The *recepta de scaccario compotorum*, after dwindling under Clopton, came to an end with Cusance in 1350, while the "foreign" receipt was much reduced by the discontinuance of the practice of paying loans and taxes into the wardrobe. Later in the reign, we shall find that what was, between 1334 and 1350, called "receipt from the exchequer of accounts," reappeared, though sparingly, under the heading of foreign receipt.²

Just as the deanery of St. Martin's-le-Grand perhaps bribed Cusance to return to office,³ so the archdeaconry of Cornwall consoled him for the loss of it in February 1350.⁴ He was growing an old man, however, and soon disappeared from history.

With Cusance, William Dalton, controller since 1344 under three keepers, left office. A grant to him, in consideration of his long service, of the robes and wages of controller for the rest of his life, whether present or absent from court, might suggest his retirement,⁵ but for the fact that three years later he was made keeper of the great wardrobe, and remained in that office from 1353 to 1359.⁶ We are left in some doubt as to his competence for higher office or as to the possibility of disfavour in high quarters.⁷

The plague was now over, warlike operations were fitfully

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/51. The total expenses, excluding prests, were only £7480 : 6 : 10 $\frac{1}{2}$, "foreign expenses" being £670; the prests amounted to £749 : 16 : 10 $\frac{3}{4}$, but after all allowances and deductions had been made the deficit was only £66 odd.

² See later, pp. 149-150. Compare above, pp. 97-98.

³ He was appointed on June 19, 1349; *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 305.

⁴ He was appointed by the king on Feb. 15, 1350; *ib.* p. 462.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 449.

⁶ See later, pp. 383, 432-434.

⁷ His father, Sir Robert Dalton, was constable of the Tower from 1341 to 1346: *C.F.R.* v. 212; *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 54; *ib.*, 1343-45, p. 117, makes it clear that the controller was Sir Robert's son. On Good Friday, 1347, Sir John Dalton, son of Sir Robert, created a great scandal by taking violent possession of the manor of Beams, near Reading, where the court of Lionel of Antwerp, the regent, was then established. Two men were killed; much property seized; the king's children at Reading terrorised; and the lady of the manor, Margaret, widow of Sir Nicholas de la Beche (see for him above, iii. 121, iv. 81), who

renewed, and conditions were more normal again. Little change is seen in wardrobe history under the next wardrobe keeper, who was that William Retford whom we have known already as clerk of the kitchen,¹ and who had been since January 31, 1349, keeper of the great wardrobe.² Retford was now promoted directly from that office to the headship of the wardrobe of the household, which he retained from February 14, 1350, to February 23, 1353.³ Under him William Shrewsbury, a new name in wardrobe history, acted as controller until January 5, 1352,⁴ when he was replaced by John Buckingham, who had been, like Retford, keeper of the great wardrobe and was now steadily mounting towards a high station in state and church.⁵

Retford's keepership lasted for three years and a few days. His transactions are only known to us by a somewhat meagre enrolment.⁶ No particulars of his accounts have survived, and

lived there with a new husband, was carried off by a gang of desperadoes of position, largely Lancashire men, and forcibly married to John Dalton. The malefactors fled to the march of Scotland, but judicial proceedings against them occupied much space in the patent and fine rolls of 1347; *C.F.R.* vi. 80-81; *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, pp. 310-312, 318-320, etc. However, things were soon hushed up. In July 1347 Henry of Lancaster obtained pardons for some of the Lancashire culprits; *ib.*, 1345-48, pp. 344, 543-544. Sir Robert himself and his wife were pardoned and restored in 1348, because they were proved "guiltless of the principal perpetration of the felonies"; *ib.*, 1348-50, pp. 99-101. By 1350 Margaret was dead and Sir John Dalton, the chief offender, was pardoned "for good service and humble submission" (*ib.* p. 498), and was soon receiving £50 a year from the exchequer to "maintain himself in the king's service"; *ib.* p. 540. It is abundantly clear that the misdeeds of his kinsmen did not prevent William rising to the top of the official hierarchy. Few officials had the good fortune to be without disreputable relatives. ¹ See above, pp. 114-116.

² *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 257.

³ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/1.

⁴ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/1. I have erroneously continued Shrewsbury in office for another year in *E.H.R.* xxix. 503, and correspondingly shortened the term of Buckingham. The wardrobe accounts are too defective for this period to make it safe to dwell on the absence of Shrewsbury's name from them, but the chancery rolls only record his belated presentment to various prebends and benefices. He was king's clerk before 1345, and was acting in 1348 as treasurer of Calais, for which office he accounted from 21 to 24 Edw. III., *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, xi., *Enr. Accts.* p. 43. *Pipe*, 194/44, 46 (23 E. III.). He also acted as keeper of the king's mint at Calais with instructions to make money of the same weight and alloy as in England; *C.P.R.*, 1346-49, p. 465; *C.W.* 328/19225, printed by Viard and Déprez in *Chronique de Jean le Bel*, ii. 352. He was still alive in 1364, when he was pardoned small arrears in his wardrobe account for his good services; *C.C.R.*, 1364-68, p. 10.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 468. See also above, iii. 218, 222, 227, etc., and below, pp. 381-383, 387, and vol. v. ch. xvi.

⁶ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/1.

the chancery rolls which gave us such copious information about wardrobe business in earlier times have now become, and remain, silent regarding it. All we know is that income and expenditure remained at the same modest level at which they had stood since the capture of Calais. For the whole of the three years Retford's annual income was a little more than £19,000 a year, six-sevenths of which came from the exchequer of receipt. It was perhaps a result of the appropriation of manors to the support of the household that the "foreign receipt" for Retford's period amounted in all to £6064 : 8 : 4, that is to say, to more than £2000 a year. As compared with the years before the Clopton-Cusance experiment, this was about £800 a year in excess of the earlier years. By so much then did the wardrobe manors swell the wardrobe receipt. As the extra-*hospicium* expenses were now reduced to a low figure, the result was not unsatisfactory. The whole annual expenditure was a little less than £19,000. Accordingly, for the first time since 1332-33, and for the second time in the whole reign, the expenses were lower than the receipt. A large proportion of the outlay went towards maintaining the *hospicium*, the cost of which was now permanently higher than in the early years of the reign. Whether the king's love of splendour, or the great increase in the cost of living and depreciation of the currency resulting from the war and the plague, was the leading cause of this, would be a delicate point to determine. More important is it to recognise that, except when the king went beyond sea with his army, the wardrobe had become in fact what it was in name, the wardrobe of the household. Its restriction to the domestic sphere is sufficient to account for the little information about it now found in the records of the offices of state.

The low level of Retford's income and expenditure is the more remarkable since, after Michaelmas 1351, an element came into the accounts which had disappeared from them since the separation of the great wardrobe from household accountability in 1323. From Michaelmas 1351 until All Saints 1360 the great wardrobe and the butlerage again accounted in the wardrobe instead of in the exchequer. The results of this curious reaction in accountability will be examined elsewhere,¹ but we must here record two points arising

¹ See below, pp. 431-437.

from it. The inclusion of the great wardrobe account reduced to still more modest proportions the income and expenditure of the strict "wardrobe of the household." The change backwards cannot but be associated with the numerous financial experiments and innovations with which we have ventured to connect the name of Edington. The relation of this particular innovation to the other novelties is difficult to determine, but it is hard not to regard them all as part of a common policy.

The subordination of great wardrobe to wardrobe was the easier since John Buckingham, who was keeper of the great wardrobe at the time of the change, was within a year transferred to the wardrobe of the household as its controller, and, on Retford's retirement, he assumed the keepership of the wardrobe on February 23, 1353.¹ Buckingham retained that office till February 26, 1357, almost exactly four years, and for all that period and beyond it James Beaufort was controller. The first year of Buckingham's keepership showed revenue and expenditure only slightly in excess of those of Retford, namely £22,556 income and £25,446 expenses. The balance was, as often, on the wrong side, and the survival of detailed particulars, for the first time since the days of Wetwang, enables us to see precisely whence the money was derived and how it was expended.² An even greater

¹ See above, p. 131, n. 5.

² *E.A.* 392/12. The keeper's account for 1353-54 was tendered to the exchequer on June 10, 1355, along with the controller's book for the same period. But there was some little delay in considering them, because the auditor appointed to deal with them was fully occupied otherwise, and operations were not begun until the octave of Michaelmas, though they were completed soon after the following Christmas; *M.R.K.R.* 131, Com., Trin. t. "Anglia. Memorandum quod Johannes de Bukyngham, custos garderobe regis, venit hic coram baronibus, x^o die Junii hoc anno, et liberauit hic unum librum de receptis et expensis eiusdem garderobe de anno xxvij^o regis huius. Et prestitit sacramentum de bene et fideliter computando de eadem garderoba de eodem tempore. Et Thomas de Brantyngham, clericus et attornatus Jacobi de Beauford, contrarotulatoris hospicii regis eodem anno, liberauit hic quendam librum ipsius contrarotulatoris de eodem tempore. Et prestitit sacramentum de fideliter testificando compotum supradictum et de faciendo super eundem compotum quod idem contrarotulator fecerit si personaliter interesset. Et Robertus de Plesseleye, unus auditorum huius scaccarii, assignatur ad compotum illum audiendum. Et quia non potuit percomputare durante termino, datus est dies eidem hic ad percomputandum in octavis sancti Michaelis, quem diem assumpsit periculo quod etc. Ad quem diem dictus Johannes venit et fuit in computando usque finem termini. Et quia non potuit percomputare durante termino, habet diem ulterius usque crastinum sancti Hillarii, sicut continetur in memorandis anni sequentis inter dies datos de termino sancti Michaelis."

proportion of income than usual came from the exchequer of receipt, namely £18,175 : 5 : 2. The "foreign receipt" amounted indeed to £4381 : 11 : 2 $\frac{1}{4}$, but nearly the whole of this, no less than £3972 : 15 : 2 $\frac{1}{2}$, represented the "remnant" and store of victuals remaining from Retford's period. Accordingly, we see that the foreign receipt was practically nominal, and that supplies to the wardrobe came from the exchequer almost exclusively. The "wardrobe manors" had ceased either to exist or to be productive. Nearly half the expenses of the year were devoted to the maintenance of the royal household, which cost £12,151 : 7 : 3 $\frac{1}{2}$. The other half went in defraying charges directly incidental to the household, classed under the usual headings.

It is significant that the household staff remained almost as large as in periods of active warfare. There were still seven "bannerets of the household," though only twelve "simple knights" received fees and robes. There were five clerks of the privy seal, and after these there came for the first time the "clerk of the secret seal," Richard Norwich, who was clearly equated with the privy seal clerks as regards robes and salary. Further, it is indicative of the declining activity of the king that the *familia regis* remained for the whole year in southern England, celebrating the chief feasts in royal manors near London : Easter and Christmas at Eltham, St. George's day at Windsor, and Pentecost at Thurrock. All Saints alone was kept outside the London area, at Northampton. Even more important is the fact that the only recorded visit to Westminster was in June, in Whit-week, for two days, on the latter of which, June 6, the king gave a feast to John of Clermont and other "knights of France" at Westminster, a characteristic exhibition of courtesy to an enemy who, some two years later, was slain by the English in the battle of Poitiers.¹ The irregular fighting of the year, whether in Scotland or France, had no effect upon the wardrobe because the king took no personal part in it. Moreover, the wardrobe keeper was in no way tied down to his duties at court, for Buckingham received expenses allowances *extra curiam* for 165 days, nearly half the year.

¹ For John of Clermont, marshal of France, see Delachenal, *Charles V.* i. 93, 127, 130, ii. 382-383. Other royal guests were John of Montfort, duke of Brittany, the duke of Lancaster and bishop Edington.

It is unfortunate that we have few similar details as regards the operations of the wardrobe during the three remaining years of Buckingham's account. There was a certain increase in its receipts, for those averaged for this period about £43,000. The gross receipt for the three years was £128,988 : 14 : 8, of which all but £1,598 : 16 : 1 came from the exchequer of receipt. The expenses amounted to £123,250 : 9 : 0 $\frac{3}{4}$, or, with the *prestita*, £132,182 : 15 : 3 $\frac{1}{4}$.¹

When Buckingham gave up office in February 1357, three short-lived successors carried on his responsibilities. The first of these was William Retford, who had, as we have seen, been also his predecessor. Since November 1354 Retford had been a baron of the exchequer.² By one of the curious exchanges of office, which were frequent in the latter part of Edward III.'s reign, Buckingham now stepped into Retford's place at the exchequer,³ thus finally abandoning the wardrobe, and soon being promoted to the keepership of the privy seal. Thence he was raised in 1362 to the bishopric of Lincoln. The only holder of a high wardrobe office between 1345 and 1360 to obtain dignity either in church or state, Buckingham's career breaks somewhat the monotony of mediocrity which surrounded the wardrobe officers of this period.

The successors to Buckingham were no exceptions to this generalisation, not even Retford himself, though he was now called for a second time to become keeper of the wardrobe. His new term of office lasted nearly a year and ten months, from February 26, 1357, to December 16, 1358. His accounts are somewhat larger than those of Buckingham. His sum of receipts amounted to £115,473, of which all but £1,925 came from the exchequer of receipt. The expenses were somewhat greater, attaining £122,627.⁴ With these accounts his official career ended, though he survived until early 1373.⁵ He received a scanty reward as regards ecclesiastical preferment. In 1364, on

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/2, 2d.

² *C.P.R.*, 1354-58, p. 142. The date is Nov. 27, so that nine months had elapsed since Retford left the wardrobe on Feb. 23.

³ *Ib.*, 1354-58, p. 522. His appointment as baron was on April 4, 1357, in the place of the king's clerk, William de Retford.

⁴ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/1d.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1370-74, p. 260, for, on Mar. 9, 1373, a new appointment to his prebend at Salisbury, vacated by his death.

an erroneous rumour of his death, Lionel of Antwerp presented one of his clerks to a prebend held by him in Ireland, and the grant had to be cancelled.¹

Retford's successor, Henry Walton, archdeacon of Richmond, had been, in early life, a favourite clerk of Henry of Lancaster, to whom he acted as receiver at least between 1348 and 1350,² and to him he owed his rectory of Preston, his rich archdeaconry, and much other preferment.³ He was so highly esteemed by the Lancastrian tenantry that a group of earl Henry's Leicestershire tenants, when founding a chantry at St. Martin's, Leicester, put him immediately after the king and the earl among those for whose spiritual welfare offerings were to be made.⁴ By 1351 he had also become a king's clerk, and Edward "by reason of his affection for him" confirmed him in the quasi-episcopal powers exercised by him in his archdeaconry.⁵ Yet, after the curious fashion of the time, Walton continued in the service of his old master.⁶

For the next few years Walton seldom figures in the records, except as the recipient of more prebends and other preferment.⁷ Then he was suddenly put over the wardrobe as Retford's successor on December 16, 1358, and seems to have been active enough at first. Before Whitsuntide 1359 he held the "feast of *feer marchaunt*" in his own lodging, after the jousts at Smithfield, receiving for this purpose, by the king's command, material from the great wardrobe.⁸ Soon he was plunged into the preparations for the expedition which Edward III. now proposed to lead into France. The result was that both Walton and his controller,

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1364-67, p. 4: "because William de Retford is alive and well, the king revokes his son's collation."

² *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, pp. 502, 514; *ib.*, 1349-54, pp. 203, 219, 370, 376. In the latter reference he is called his treasurer. Compare *C. Pap. R. Pet.* i. 225, 238, 239.

³ He appears as parson of Preston in 1348; *C. Pap. R. Pet.* i. 151, 152, 193, 225, 282; *ib. Let.* iii. 277, 290, and *passim*.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 379. This was on Aug. 19, 1349. A short time afterwards Lancaster gave Walton the free chapel within Clitheroe castle for life; *ib.* p. 469.

⁵ *ib.*, 1350-54, p. 182. He is called king's clerk in Feb. 1351; *ib.* p. 36.

⁶ Thus in Nov. 1351, he certifies for protections to Lancaster's followers; *ib.*, 1350-54, pp. 36, 182, and remained his receiver till 1353; *C. Pap. R. Pet.* i. 239.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1354-58, p. 132, ratifies his estate in four prebends besides his Preston rectory.

⁸ *C.C.R.*, 1360-64, pp. 36-37.

William Farley, spent much time *extra curiam*, and were represented in the court by deputies. When Farley was on the point of going abroad, in September 1359, he made his clerk, John Uppingham, his deputy controller in England;¹ but there is no evidence that Walton was going overseas as well, though his wardrobe work was already being discharged by attorneys. Probably Walton was, even then, incapacitated by illness, although he provided for the household forces the usual military contingent expected from a person in his position.² It is certain, too, that he received wages *extra curiam* from October 4 to November 2, 1359.³ There is little doubt but that he died in England, perhaps on November 2 or 3, 1359,⁴ a few days after the king with his household had crossed, on October 28, to Calais.⁵ A writ of the regency, dated November 15, at Woodstock, ordered that his lands and goods should be taken into the king's hands until his wardrobe accounts, which extended from December 16, 1358, to November 3, 1359, were rendered by his executors.⁶

The controllers of these years were fewer and longer in office than the keepers. James Beaufort, who had succeeded Buckingham in 1353, retained responsibility until April 21, 1358, under three keepers, Buckingham, Retford and Walton. He died soon afterwards, for on June 12 his Oxfordshire property was seized as security, since he had not as yet been acquitted for the imprests received by him from Buckingham, who had gone out of wardrobe office in the previous year.⁷ The next controller was William Farley, who acted for the latter part of Retford's time and for the whole of Walton's keepership, nearly two years in all. Before attaining this rank, he had been for almost twenty years engaged in wardrobe work, though not in any conspicuous position. As far back as 1341 he had acted under Edington, then keeper of the wardrobe,⁸ and as a king's

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, pp. 262, 294. For this see later, pp. 141, 142, 147.

² *E.A.* 393/11, f. 86. His contingent included 1 knight, 16 esquires and 61 archers, who drew wages from Aug. 16 to Nov. 14, 1359, but no longer.

³ He was "*extra curiam super negotiis regis*" from Oct. 4 to Nov. 2; *ib.* ff. 63-63d.

⁴ His account ended Nov. 3; his will was proved at Lambeth on Nov. 17; *M.R.L.K.R.* 132, fines and manucaptions, Hil. t. m. 2.

⁵ *Foedera*, iii. 452.

⁶ *C.F.R.* vii. 111-112. *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/3. His successor as archdeacon of Richmond was admitted by archbishop Thoresby on Dec. 14, the office being vacated by Walton's death; *Le Neve*, iii. 138.

⁷ *Ib.* vii. 66.

⁸ *C.P.R.*, 1341-43, p. 346.

clerk,¹ in receipt of wages of war, he attended Edward III. on the Crécy-Calais campaign.² This experience gave him particular claim to the keepership. Both as controller and as keeper he was the soul of the preparations for the king's 1359-60 campaign, and the director of its administration.

The coincidence of Walton's illness with the preparations for that campaign led to some confusion. Farley, his controller, as we shall see, did most of the work, and it was, therefore, the line of least resistance that, when Walton died, Farley should himself be the next keeper. The general principles of the division of the administration, which followed earlier precedents, have been already indicated.³ There was the usual delay in getting the forces over the sea, but the king was abroad by the end of October, and it was vital that the army, mustered at Calais, should at once start operations. Thus, there was no time for accounting, and Farley found it convenient to charge his own account as keeper with certain of his predecessor's obligations. This explains why Walton's account, only properly to be understood in the light of Farley's account, showed such modest figures for both expenses and receipts. The receipt was only £42,830 for the eleven months, while the expenses amounted to no more than £34,180. Farley's account ranges, nominally, from November 3, 1359, to November 7, 1360, but actually it covers a longer period. Of this we happily possess full particulars, which enable us to study in one account the finances of the whole campaign and of the subsequent peace negotiations.⁴ The figures are naturally large, much larger indeed than those of any wardrobe account since the days of the king's personal campaigning between 1338 and 1346. A total receipt of £129,368, and a total expense of £149,722, though smaller sums than the vast totals of the early years of the war, show that Farley was no mere supervisor of household accounts, but the paymaster of an

¹ He is so called in 1346; *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 127. For his preferments, see *ib.* pp. 127, 138, 323.

² *E.A.* 391/9. Wrottesley, *Crécy and Calais*, makes the usual mistake of assuming that every "dominus" was a knight. Farley was again abroad for two years in 1352-54; *C.P.R.*, 1350-54, p. 231.

³ See above, iii. 222-224.

⁴ Farley's account is dated from the day after Edward started from Calais on his invasion of France; *Eul. Hist.* iii. 228, "et die sabbati, id est in commemoratione animarum vexilla displicuit, super Franciam equitando."

army and of a diplomatic service. The trouble is that, with all its apparent copiousness of detail, the account is sadly lacking in precision and leaves much unexplained.

Farley was supported by capable subordinates. His controller was William Clee, a king's clerk of even longer standing than his chief. Clee, so far back as 1339, had been collecting horses to be sent to the king in the Netherlands.¹ Latterly, as clerk of the *avenerie*, he had been active in gathering together oats and hay for the royal horses. The magnitude of his operations in this department during the preparations for the 1359-60 expedition is shown by the fact that he had twenty-three subordinates, acting under him in various parts of England, while none of the other purveyors of the household had more than four or five.² This departmental activity doubtless gave him peculiar qualifications for promotion under war conditions. Thomas Brantingham was the cofferer, and was the most conspicuous of Farley's other officers. The efficiency with which he carried out his duties in connection with the financing of the expedition secured his early promotion. He was the only one of the younger wardrobe clerks of the period who attained high political office and a bishopric.³

Acting with these three clerks, Farley, Clee and Brantingham, were the steward of the household, Sir Guy Brian, the acting chamberlain and the vice-chamberlain, Sir John Chandos. All these were warriors of high reputation whose position could only be magnified by the martial conditions under which the household was now to work.⁴ Towards the end of the fighting period, diplomacy became more important than military operations, and in this the household staff took a large share. Such diplomacy has already been considered in its more general relations,⁵ and

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 65. Earlier in 1336 he was attorney for the executors of Ebulo Lestrangle, the husband of Alice Lacy, Thomas of Lancaster's widow; *ib.*, 1333-37, p. 722. His name is clearly from the Lincolnshire Clee, near Grimsby. He was parson of Waltham, not far off, until 1354. For Waltham's official associations see above, iii. 215-216, n. 4.

² *Ib.*, 1354-60, pp. 544-545. He was already in 1355 engaged in the same business of purveying for the sustenance of the king's horses; *C.P.R.*, 1354-58, p. 324.

³ For his career and family and official connections, see above, iii. 248-249, 261-262, etc.

⁴ For the military side of the household during this campaign, see above, iii. 225.

⁵ See for this above, iii. 226-227.

will be considered in more detail when we come to relate the history of the privy seal.¹ We must, however, record here the curious archaism which once more for these months brought back into the royal household and wardrobe both chancery and privy seal clerks, as well as the seals they served, and united them in a common obedience to John Winwick, the keeper of both the great and the privy seals. This official, whom the French called the king's chancellor, was the political director of the expedition. His subordinates, whether attached to the chancery or to the privy seal, like their chief, received their wages and robes from Farley, but were in no wise in subjection to the wardrobe. Even less dependent on the wardrobe was the great host of warriors, to which all the chief magnates contributed their quota, though they were also in wardrobe pay.² These incongruities increased wardrobe work and responsibility, but, as far as they were concerned, the wardrobe was little more than an office of accounts.

We have often seen long delays and grave difficulties in the way of audit of wardrobe accounts, but rarely were the difficulties more obstinate than those met with in dealing with the accounts covering the expedition of 1359 and its aftermath. The cause was not lack of care, but rather the complex arrangements made for the discharge of wardrobe work, work which was in itself complicated. The troubles began before Walton's tenure was over. At a period of intense activity keeper Walton was prevented by ill-health from playing his proper part, and controller Farley's task was rendered twice as exacting by his being sent to France early in the autumn of 1359. We have already seen that, on Walton's death, Farley became his successor,

¹ See later, vol. v. ch. xvi.

² The diplomatic work in which the household took part, and the fact that the household did not accompany the king to England in May 1360, as we shall see later, meant that considerable "extra curiam" expenses were incurred by various members. Farley himself received such wages for 199 days out of his year of account; Guy Brian for 91 days, and Winwick continuously for 47 days from May 31 to July 12, 1360. Buckingham, who succeeded him on July 1, 1360, was away from court for the first six months of his term of office; *E.A.* 393/11, ff. 62, 62d, 63: the account is not clear as far as Buckingham is concerned, for it allows him expenses from July 1 to Dec. 21 as for 178 days, though the actual number of days in that period is only 174. Both controller Clee and cofferer Brantingham were sent on a mission to Bruges. Brantingham, despite his special obligations as paymaster, was out of court for 30 days. These absences seem mainly to have been due to the return of Edward from France on May 18, 1360.

and that, in consequence, his attendance on the king in France between November 1359 and May 1360 prevented his doing anything effective towards preparing Walton's account for audit. It looks as if Uppingham, who, as already mentioned, had been appointed deputy controller in England for Farley in September 1359, remained in London as a sort of liaison officer between the wardrobe abroad and the government in England, even after the death of Walton, when Farley had become keeper; and that he recorded and classified the huge advances made in the summer of 1359 to the soldiers and clerks who, without them, were unable to equip themselves and their followers for the campaign.¹

However that may be, no substantial progress in accounting could be made until the campaign and the subsequent negotiations were concluded, especially as, before then, Farley's books as controller were not likely to be ready. Even when Edward returned to England, he took with him only his *secreta familia*, the bulk of the household following the army on its slow march to Calais. When it did reach England, it was soon sent abroad again, to be detained at Calais until peace was concluded in October 1360. Thus it happened that, before Walton's account was ready for audit, the account of his successor, Farley, terminated on November 7, 1360, and required arrayment for the auditors' consideration. In this way the audit of the two accounts ran concurrently. It was not until June 22, 1360, that the conclusion of the necessary preliminaries of proving Walton's will and ascertaining the value of his estate enabled his executors to assume responsibility at the exchequer for his account as keeper of the wardrobe, when they made Brantingham, back from France, their attorney to array and present the account. Then, because it was found that the rolls and books relating to that account were not yet arrayed, nor could be put in order quickly, six months were allowed for them to be prepared.² The account was

¹ When Farley's account as keeper was audited, Uppingham was concerned with it as attorney for Farley when Walton's controller, because certain receipts of Walton were accounted for by Farley in his keeper's account; *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/3.

² *M.R.L.T.R.* 132, fines, manucapciones, etc., Hil. t. m. 2: "quia rotuli et libri tangentes dictum compotum nondum arraiantur nec in breui arraiari poterunt."

finally presented at the exchequer in January 1361, Farley himself handing over the records of his controllership. It was delivered to be engrossed on February 25.¹

Uppingham was still at work in London when, in the early months of 1361, the much more difficult account for Farley's keepership was being put into order for presentation. When Brantingham, the cofferer, was called away to act as treasurer of Calais, the completion of the engrossment of that account, on which Brantingham had been employed, was committed to Uppingham.² Farley's account as finally audited was the result of eighteen months' hard work, for the whole of which time Uppingham seems to have been engaged on it. He well deserved the auditorship of the exchequer which he received in October and which he enjoyed for the rest of Edward III.'s reign. One serious complication was that, though Farley had been almost continuously abroad, he had to approve the accounts of the great wardrobe and of the butlerage of wines, which mainly dealt with transactions in England. Here again war exigencies compelled the administration to take a step backwards.³

There were still "wages of war" to be assessed and calculated. Some of them went back as far as Walton's time, and many of them were incompletely assessed. But the activity of Farley and the energy of Brantingham and Uppingham soon reduced the chaos into order. The exchequer was easily satisfied, and the account, presented by Farley's own hand on May 12, 1361,⁴ was eventually passed. Yet inspection of the surviving particulars makes us wonder why the exchequer accepted them so readily. Even when taken in conjunction with Walton's account, they do not approach completeness. There was the additional complication, moreover, that Edward III. had, on his return to England in May 1360, set up a second wardrobe of the household.⁵ We shall see later that the account

¹ *M.R.L.T.R.* 132, fines, manucap. Hil. t. m. 2.

² *C.C.R.*, 1364-68, pp. 231-232, gives us these particulars with reference to the demand made by the exchequer against the king's butler in 1366. See later, p. 147, n. 2.

³ For the effect of this on the great wardrobe, see later, pp. 431-437.

⁴ *E.A.* 393/11, title-page; compare *M.R.K.R.* 137. com. rec. Easter t. William Humberstone, clerk and attorney of Clee, Farley's controller, was with Farley at the time of its rendering; *ib. breu. dir. bar.* Easter t. m. 21; *C.C.R.*, 1364-68, pp. 231-232.

⁵ See above, iii. 227, and below, pp. 143-147.

of this duplicate office, when presented by its keeper, William Ferriby, had to contend with difficulties of its own. Though it terminated on November 13, 1361, it was not until January 1363 that Ferriby was in a position to get from chancery an order to the exchequer to account with him, and probably it was considerably later that his account was passed. But it was, of course, for part of the period it covered, supplementary to Farley's account, and must be considered along with that account, in order to obtain figures approximating with some accuracy to the real income and expenditure of Farley's keepership. Soon after Farley had presented his account, he was appointed constable of Bordeaux, and by the autumn of 1361 he was in Aquitaine, working at his new task.¹

When we attempt to analyse the receipts of Farley's account, our scrutiny raises problems difficult to explain. In the first place the *recepta scaccarii* began on July 25, 1359, nearly four months before Farley was made keeper, and went on to October 1361, though the account was considered to have ended in the previous November. Without unduly stressing the figures, it is remarkable that something approaching four-fifths of the receipts were recorded as received either before or after the dates technically covered by the account.² A very small proportion of the total "exchequer receipt" of £108,624 : 5 : 7½ was actually handled by the wardrobe; most of it was paid

¹ On July 1, 1361, he was appointed constable of Bordeaux in succession to John Streatley (*Gascon Roll*. 74/8). He took over his office on Sept. 20, and remained in Gascony until his death on Sept. 11, 1362. Previously to that, the appointment of the prince of Wales as prince of Aquitaine, on July 19, 1362, had put all offices in the prince's hands. Accordingly, Farley's executors were ordered to account to the exchequer up to that date only, and their account is still extant in *Pipe*, 210/50, and *E.A.* 176/4, 13. For his death and the delay in the accounting, see *M.R.L.T.R.* 138, status et visus compotorum Trin. t. m. 1. Curiously enough Farley's successor, Bernard Brocas, was appointed by the crown and until April 10, 1364, accounted at the English exchequer; *Pipe*, 211/42. After that the Gascon accounts disappear from the English records until after the Black Prince's recall in 1372.

² *E.A.* 393/11, ff. 1-13d. The most striking receipts were £30,031 : 16 : 0½ between July and September 1359, and £49,633 : 2 : 8 between October 1360 and March 1361. The whole of the former period is outside the account, and of the latter period only that between October and Nov. 7 included in it. No receipts were recorded between Oct. 4 and Nov. 7, 1359. War expenses were therefore either paid in advance of, or subsequently to, the actual operations. Walton's prests tell a similar tale. These points are not peculiar to this particular account, but show with exceptional emphasis the technicalities of wardrobe bookkeeping in war time.

directly by the exchequer.¹ Similarly, £13,647 : 14 : 10½ of the total £20,743 : 16 : 0¾ “foreign receipt,” were *prestita* of Walton, received by him in the name of divers members of the king’s household *super vadiis guerre*. From these two sources came the *summa recepte* of £129,368 : 1 : 8¼. To that masses of debt must be added, amounting to £31,431 : 12 : 6¾. Of this sum £30,386 : 17 : 7¾ were *debita per billas*, £127 : 14 : 8¼ *debita per tallias*, and £917 : 0 : 3 *debita sine billis*. A number of these items were cancelled² on their being paid at the exchequer, up to dates as late as 43 Edward III., which lightened by £10,555 : 6 : 10 the heavy burden of debt Farley had incurred. The account, as it is now, is not exactly the account as Farley presented it.

If we turn to expenses, we are not on much more certain ground. There is the ordinary daily summary of the *hospicium* expenses with detailed amounts under each “office.” The total is unusually moderate, amounting to only £8554 : 6 : 0½ for more than a year. The expenses under other normal headings were also small, “alms,” for example, being only £328 : 8 : 11, though the king made his offerings in due course at the great feasts, on Christmas day at Verzy, near Reims, at Chanteloup, near Poissy, where he kept Easter, and once at the shrine of an English saint, St. Edmund, at Pontigny. The real burden on the wardrobe was the *vadia guerre*, which amounted to a sum exceeding the receipt, namely £133,820 : 16 : 6½. The mass of this went to the various magnates for the wages of themselves and their contingents.³ But, as in the Netherlandish and Crécy periods, a small military force was provided by each officer of the household, including such persons as were temporarily brought within its purview, like clerks of the chancery and privy seal.⁴

¹ For example, £1288 : 18 : 0 were “received by the wardrobe by the hands of the earl of Arundel,” and £655 : 1 : 4 “by the hands of the earl of Suffolk,” on July 25, 1359. On Aug. 26 the prince of Wales had it recorded against him that the wardrobe had received £5980 : 11 : 2½ from the exchequer by his hands.

² *E.A.* 393/11, f. 32.

³ The prince of Wales received wages for himself at 20s.; 7 bannerets at 4s.; 136 knights at 2s.; 443 esquires at 1s.; 900 archers at 6d., between Sept. 2, 1359, and May 31, 1360; *ib.* f. 77. Lancaster received for himself at 13s. 4d.; 6 bannerets, 90 knights, 126 esquires and 423 archers.

⁴ The entry regarding Farley’s contingent may illustrate this: “Domino W. de Farley, custodi garderobe hospicii domini regis, pro vadiis suis guerre ad ij s.; xiiij scutiferis, quolibet ad xij d. et xxxvij sagittariis, quolibet ad vj d. per diem.” The periods extended continuously from Aug. 25, 1359, to June 2, 1360. Besides wages there were a special “rewardum” and transport expenses

The *titulus* of alms has the merit of telling us the places where the king was at the great feasts of the church, but the *hospicium* diary, though giving expenses day by day, does not, as usual, specify the place where the household was. This omission was probably due to lack of evidence rather than to indifference. In spite of that, comparison between the household expenses at different periods does give us valuable information. It shows that expenses were small while the army was on the march or staying for a while in the enemy's country, and that the further the army got away from its base, the less the household cost. Thus the average daily expense of £29 for the first four weeks declined to £21 in December, and went on decreasing until in March and April, the time of the fighting round Paris, it fell to £16. During the Chartres negotiations and the move to the coast, expenses rose to £26 a day. After the king's return to England with his *secreta familia* on May 18,¹ they soared to an average of £52 up to June 2. There is a gap between June 2 and 29, when no expenses are recorded. Then, from June 30, through July and August, the expenses averaged about £11 or £12 a day, until towards the end of August they again became considerable, culminating, on October 13, at over £247, and remaining at an average approaching £50 a day, until they ended with the account on November 7. The treaty of Calais completed, there was no longer need for the magnates and household to remain abroad. On November 3 the prince of Wales and the duke of Lancaster returned to London.² The king was not much later, and on November 6 issued from Westminster orders for the proclamation of peace.³ The next

of the horses to and from Calais; *E.A.* 393/11, f. 85d. Walton's contingent was paid from Aug. 16 to Nov. 14; *ib.* f. 88d. This probably means that the news of his death only reached the army on the march about that date. For the privy seal and its clerks' wages, see vol. v. ch. xvi.

¹ "Isto die rex applicuit apud le Rye"; *E.A.* 393/11 f. 47. Compare *Foedera*, iii. 494. He embarked at Honfleur. *E.A.* 393/11 f. 64d gives the expenses charged to Farley for the passage of Edward and his "secreta familia" as £37:7:3. *Ib.* f. 61 records the payment to the master of the *James* of Sandwich "pro fretatione vesellorum coquine et aliorum officiorum de Cales usque London" on June 24. But on July 8 payment was made to William Devon for taking the king's "familia" with horses and victuals from Dover to Calais in three ships and one barge. On July 10 the king of France and other magnates arrived. The steward, treasurer and others arrived on Sept. 12; *ib.* ff. 61-62.

² *E.A.* 314/2, 3.

³ *London Letter Books*, G. p. 123. He was still issuing great seal writs at Calais on Nov. 1; *Foedera*, iii. 552.

day Farley's responsibility fittingly terminated, and with it the great days of the wardrobe of Edward III.

How can these differences in costs be explained? The low level for the actual campaigning is intelligible enough, especially in the light of the lurid stories of the French chroniclers of towns and churches held up to ransom, and of the armies living on the country.¹ The heavy spending of May 18 to June 2, the absence of expenses during June, and the low charges in the two following months only become intelligible in the light of two facts. One is that the household as a whole remained abroad for at least a month after the king's return, though it was, we imagine, gradually depleted of its members, until at last, in June, the baggage and the kitchen utensils were ferried home from Calais to London.² The other, still more significant, and already mentioned in another connection,³ is the existence of that second wardrobe of the household which Edward set up in England in May 1360, under Ferriby as keeper, and Hugh Segrave as controller. This new establishment managed the household finances in England, leaving Farley's wardrobe to deal with those of the household abroad. Thus is explained the temporary disappearance of household expenses from Farley's account, and their low totals when they reappear with the establishment of Farley and his staff at Calais. The small amounts represent the time when a mere skeleton *hospicium* was at work in France; the subsequent large ones cover the period of the reassembly at Calais, and the maintenance there of a considerable body for two or three months. Unluckily the lack of "particulars" (for we have extant only the short enrolment of Ferriby's account) prevents our being able to check this hypothesis from Ferriby's daily expenses, though we know that Ferriby's *hospicium* expenses were all incurred in England, and that their gross total almost equalled his whole income.

The peculiarity of the dual wardrobe and the unusual conditions of the time must excuse the labouring of a point which is only of importance so far as it illuminates a unique period in

¹ The best accounts of the campaign are in Denifle (ii. 336-360, and *passim*), and in Delachenal (ii. 141-192), but neither of these scholars used the English record sources, and were alike ignorant of *E.A.* 393/11. A detailed history, based on a study of all the available material, is still to be desired.

² See n. 1, p. 145, above.

³ See above, p. 142.

the history of the household. At least, it explains the curious circumstances attending Farley's account and illustrates the difficulties which beset him alike at its beginning and at its end. We see now why Farley's clerks were engaged for eighteen consecutive months in London, trying to straighten it out. It makes it clear, too, why Farley himself had six months' labour before him between the conclusion and the presentation of his account. All concerned with the array of this troublesome account received an unusually large *regardum*, or gratuity, for their services. The language in which this is recorded shows the exceptional attention which the account had demanded.¹ Nor was the matter done with when the account had been audited. Several years afterwards, royal intervention was necessary to prevent the pedants of the exchequer charging the king's butler with sums for which he had already accounted at the wardrobe.² The charge was the more gratuitous, since the resumption of normal administrative methods had been immediately followed by the restoration to the great wardrobe and butlerage of direct accountability to the exchequer.

¹ *E.A.* 393/11, f. 64 puts at the end of the "necessaria" the following significant entry: "Et predicto Willelmo de Farle, custodi garderober regis, pro expensis suis propriis et clericorum suorum, necnon clerici contrarotulatoris hospicii regis de tempore eiusdem custodis, morancium Londoniis super arraiacione et reddicione huius compoti per unum annum et dimidium, per consideracionem dominorum cancellarii, thesaurarii et baronum de seaccario, cclxvj li. xiiij s. et iiij d. Et eo plus quia tam compota clericis magne garderober quam pincerne, vocate camerarii vinorum regis, de toto tempore dicti Willelmi custodis, continentur in isto compoto. Et similiter ob maximum laborem et fatigacionem quos idem custos sustinuit circa compotum vadium guerre de viagio domini regis ultimo facto in partibus Francie, ante concordiam pacis initam inter ipsum dominum nostrum regem Anglie et regem Francie in isto compoto similiter contentum." I have after some hesitation extended the "moranc." into "morancium" and made it apply to the whole group of clerks engaged on the account. I was led to this conclusion by the occurrence of a similar formula in Walton's account (*Enr. Accts. W. and H.* 4/3), in spite of the fact that Farley himself was absent from England for the greater part of the period covered by this account. The actual date of this "eighteen months" must remain doubtful, as we do not know the date of the acceptance of the account by the exchequer. Uppingham was the only leading clerk involved who could have been continuously in London for the eighteen months from Nov. 1359 to May 1361. The period probably was the eighteen months immediately subsequent to the conclusion of the account. The entry makes it clear that Nov. 7, 1360, was the last day for which the great wardrobe and the butlerage accounted to the wardrobe of the household. See also later, p. 434.

² *C.C.R.*, 1364-68, pp. 231-232 gives, under June 20, 1366, the mandate to the exchequer to stay its demand on John Stody, the king's butler, since he had already accounted to Farley at the wardrobe for the wine with which he was charged at the exchequer. For Stody see later, pp. 197-198, n. 6.

With Farley's retirement, Ferriby, his independent colleague from May 29 to November 7, 1360, became keeper of an undivided wardrobe, over which he presided from November 8, 1360, to November 13, 1361. We know little of his history and personality except that he was a member of one of those administrative families who traced their origin to the banks of the Humber, and whose kinship to each other is difficult to ascertain.¹ The one account which he presented covers the whole period from May 1360 to November 1361, but its enrolment is so summary that we cannot analyse it with the particularity with which we have examined the account of his predecessor. We can do little more than guess at the distinction between his sphere of work as head of a complementary establishment to that of Farley, and his sphere as sole keeper. His continuance in office even after hostilities were over, and Farley's department had come back to England in May 1360, was due, as we have already pointed out, to the fact that Farley and his staff went abroad again almost immediately. It was desirable then to maintain a household in England as well as one in Calais, and that household, as no regency had been appointed, could only be a household of the king. This bifurcation of the household was in fact, as we have observed elsewhere,² an extension of the principle which had so often divided into two sections the council, the chancery and the office of the privy seal. Accordingly, as soon as the king returned from Calais after the treaty was concluded, one or other of the two branches naturally would come to an end.³

Ferriby's account is as abnormal as that of Farley. It was easier to set up a new office than to finance it, and the enrolment shows that Ferriby obtained his supplies in an unusual fashion.

¹ It is not clear whether his name comes from North Ferriby in the East Riding or South Ferriby in Lindsey. He was doubtless akin to Richard Ferriby, controller and keeper between 1332 and 1337 (see above, ii. 273, and iii. 79, 97-98), and may have been the William Ferriby who was executor to archbishop Melton. The king appointed him dean of Hereford in 1361, but he does not seem to have been established there. Another William Ferriby, chief notary to Richard II., was associated with Maudelyn as the only clerks faithful to Richard in his misfortunes. The Ferribys may well have had some affinity with the Thoresby-Ravenser-Waltham clan from the same district. See iii. 215-216, n. 1.

² Above, iii. 227.

³ We are not told what became of Farley's staff. Farley, of course, was provided for in Gascony, and controller Clee was dead before June 1362; *C.P.R.*, 1361-64, p. 234.

His whole receipt for eighteen months was only £23,309 : 7 : 0, and of this only £13,131 : 2 : 3½ were *recepta ad scaccarium*, and no less than £10,178 : 4 : 8½ were *recepta forinseca*. Both these elements present unusual features. It is startling to find that Ferriby received nothing from the exchequer for Easter term 1360. His first exchequer receipt is recorded for October 3, 1360, when he had already been five months in office, and it was trifling in amount. In the course of that Michaelmas term he was credited with £5140 : 7 : 4, and in the Easter term following with £6002 : 18 : 1. For the two months remaining of his keepership, Michaelmas to November 13, 1361, receipts from this source fell to £585. After he had gone out of office, £1400 was credited to him by the exchequer up to the early months of 1363, when his accounts were pronounced ready for audit.

Even more interesting are the details the enrolment vouchers of his *recepta forinseca*, for it was clearly not "foreign receipt" in the old-fashioned sense of payments direct from taxes or some similar sources. We find in it such elements as £1266 : 18 : 9¾ from his successor, William Manton, *per manus diversorum creditorum*, as if it had been left to Manton to pay some of Ferriby's bills. Much the largest element came from the treasurers and receivers of queen Philippa's household. More than half was contributed by the huge single receipt of £5938 : 3 : 7½ from Philippa's receiver, Richard Ravenser.¹ Perhaps in all, two-thirds of Ferriby's foreign receipt came from the queen, a fact the more remarkable since Philippa's affairs were notoriously becoming so involved that they could only be regularised three years later by the drastic course of incorporating her household with that of her husband.² Perhaps the constant complaints of the exactions of the queen's household may not be

¹ For Richard Ravenser, as keeper of the hanaper, see above, iii. 216; and as queen's receiver see below, vol. v. ch. xviii. § I. There were also receipts of £764 : 15 : 9¾ from Richard Aston, "nuper thesaurarius Philippe regine," of £41 : 1 : 3¾ from Bristol, a town belonging to the queen, and others like them. Ravenser's appointment as receiver was announced on June 20, 1359; *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 231.

² See above, iii. 258; and later, vol. v. ch. xviii. § I. Hugh Segrave, Ferriby's controller, had long been a clerk of Philippa; *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 293. Sir John Lee, who became steward by October (*ib.* pp. 26, 152), was still steward of Philippa. Had these appointments anything to do with the utilising of her resources for the king's service? or was it the first stage towards subsequent amalgamation?

unconnected with this drain on her resources,¹ and if they were depleted to pay for her husband's household, our censures on her unthrifty housewifery are to be largely discounted. The shifts to which the settlement of the war expenses reduced the government must excite our commiseration, especially as the cause was only removed by the radical exchequer overhandling of the following decade.²

The way in which money and credit seem to have been scraped together to meet Ferriby's liabilities is the more curious since his expenses were practically limited to the daily upkeep of the households of the king and queen with their following in England.³ The sum of his expenses was £23,641 : 10 : 4½, and of this £20,390 : 17 : 9¾ were *expense hospicii*. Even with the limitation to his obligations there was therefore a small *superplusagium* or deficit against Ferriby. Although the sole responsibility for the *hospicium* rested upon Ferriby for seven months only,⁴ Farley, as we have seen, having also charged his account with over £8500 under the same head, against that must be set the fact that Ferriby was also spending for the queen.⁵ Yet, taking everything into consideration, there seems to have

¹ For instance, *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 294. ² For these see above, iii. 240-251.

³ "Idem computat in expensis hospicii regis et regine cum eorum familiis una cum elemosina statutis dietis etc." The headings, too long to quote, suggest that every item of expense of the queen and the royal family was provided by Ferriby. Yet Philippa's officers and household seem to have gone on as usual. See below, ch. xviii.

⁴ The whole of Ferriby's preamble is worth transcribing; *Exch. Accts.* (*W. and H.*) 4/5d: "Compotus Willelmi de Feriby, clerici, nuper custodis garderobe hospicii regis, de receptis, liberacionibus, et expensis factis in eadem garderoba, per breue regis, datum xxij^o die Januarii anno xxxvj^{to}, thesaurario et baronibus directum, quod est inter communia de termino sancti Michaelis, anno xxxvij^{to}, per quod rex mandauit eisdem quod computent cum eodem Willelmo de huiusmodi expensis dieti hospicii per ipsum in Anglia a xxvj^{to} die Maii, anno xxxiiiij^{to}, et deinceps pro toto tempore quo in officio illo stetit factis; et ulterius inde fieri faceret quod natura compoti requirit, eo non obstante, quod Willelmus de Farlee, nuper custos dicte garderobe, de aliis consimilibus expensis hospicii predicti per ipsum, tam in partibus cismarinis quam transmarinis, a dicto xxvi^o die Maii, usque septimum diem Nouembris tunc proximum sequentem factis, coram eisdem thesaurario et baronibus, prius computauit; videlicet de dietis receptis, liberacionibus et expensis per ipsum Willelmum de Feriby factis in eadem garderoba, a predicto xxvj^o die Maii, anno xxxiiiij^o, quo die dictum officium ei commissum fuit per ipsum regem oretenus, vsque xiiij^m diem Nouembris, anno xxxv^o, quo die Willelmus de Manton recepit officium illud; per visum et testimonium Hugonis de Segrave contrarotulatoris dicte garderobe, de eodem tempore, a quo quidem die idem Willelmus de Manton est inde computaturus."

⁵ See below, vol. v. ch. xviii. § I.

been little economy in domestic expenditure on the king's part. For Farley and Ferriby's time, the daily expenses of the household reached nearly £15,000 a year, which rather exceeded their limit in the Crécy-Calais account of 1344-47.¹

Ferriby's account was not ready for audit until fourteen months after its termination,² though we do not know when it was passed, and Ferriby himself disappears from our ken. It is not to be wondered at that the exchequer found difficulty in dealing with it, for it presented problems not before encountered. What might it be expected to include? The distinction expressed in Ferriby's preamble between his account and that of Farley must not be over-emphasised. No doubt it was broadly true that Ferriby's responsibility was primarily confined to the expenses of the household in England, and Farley's to general expenses wheresoever the wardrobe happened to be. The line of division is useful as a rough guide, but it is not to be regarded too rigidly, for Farley's responsibility for the great wardrobe and butlery shows that his was not altogether an account limited to the wardrobe's expenditure in foreign service. But it was the last of its type in our period. Just as it takes us back to the war wardrobes of the early years of the reign, or even further back to the days of Edward I. and Edward II., so Ferriby's account is a humdrum statement of daily domestic expenditure of the household, which anticipates the restricted accounts of all but one of the later keepers of Edward III.'s wardrobe.³

The English state was now so much differentiated from the court that, even in war-time, the wardrobe organisation had to be distinguished from the government of the household. But the brief experiment of a dual wardrobe of the household marked the parting of the ways. Though it had obtained for less than six months, the conditions which had called it forth were liable to recur, and when they did other means were devised to meet the situation. When the great war was renewed in 1369, the wardrobe of the household was affected only for the first year or two of military operations, and that but comparatively slightly, as we shall see.⁴ The same happened under Richard II. We may

¹ See above, p. 118.

² See his preamble on p. 150, n. 4.

³ For the one exception, namely, Wakefield's first account, see below, pp. 165-167.

⁴ See below, pp. 165-169.

ignore the few expeditions he conducted within the limits of the British islands, administered in the old-fashioned way by the household officers. For the campaigns abroad, a special political organisation under a treasurer of war, responsible to the magnates in parliament, superseded the expanded wardrobe as the directive authority under the king. We have to go on to the reign of Henry V. to find any real renewal of the extraordinary functions of wardrobe and household in the conduct of a foreign campaign.

With Ferriby's successor, William Manton, normal conditions were entirely restored. We now enter upon the last phase of wardrobe history under Edward III. The sixteen years which we have still to traverse may be treated in somewhat more summary fashion than the period which ended with the treaty of Calais. There is no real dividing line between 1361 and 1377, not even the formal rupture of the treaty in 1369. Edward was too old to carry through further expeditions abroad, and his increasingly sedentary life at home went on much the same in war as in peace. We can venture, then, to treat those years as a single whole.

A few general statements about the tendencies of wardrobe development may perhaps be hazarded as a preliminary. Time was to emphasise two characteristics already discerned, the restricted domestic sphere of the wardrobe accounts, and the general inconspicuousness of its officials. Few wardrobe officers entered the inner circle of the king's advisers, and few attained great positions in church or state. Tenure of office was fairly normal, but the proportion of chiefs who came to the wardrobe from the outside was remarkable. No less noticeable, especially towards the end of the reign, was the extent to which posts, hitherto clerical, fell gradually into the hands of laymen, and the increasing ease with which transference was effected from one government department to another, and from the service of magnates to that of the crown.

The wardrobe became more and more an office of accounts, concerned with modest operations, requiring only a moderate income and exhibiting economical spending. It made for stability that, contrary to what had obtained in earlier years, the receipts were usually now in excess of the expenses, so that the difficulties of arraying and passing the accounts were

minimised. The cause of this, as we have seen, was the substantial limitation of the wardrobe to strictly household matters, and the further reduction of costs by reason of the changed way of life of the ruler. Edward often withdrew himself altogether from the household, being technically "out of court," and wandered, within a limited area, attended for long periods together only by a very small staff, his *privata familia*. Under such conditions, there was little opportunity for the wardrobe to take an active share in the government of the realm. Were the officers busied with politics, they too had to leave the court. Some formal changes, such as the nominal increase of "foreign receipt," had no real significance as far as exchequer control was concerned. The application of the principle of concentration had already subjected the chamber to the exchequer, and in February 1363 secured the absorption of the queen's wardrobe in that of the king. The increasing frequency with which the king called to his aid in the government of his household the clerks and officers of his kinsfolk and of his nobles, helped forward the unification of administration, though it was perhaps also indicative of the comparative weakness of the crown in the face of strong opposition. All these considerations must be discussed specifically in turn.

We will begin with the wardrobe staff. Between Ferriby's resignation and the end of the reign there were six keepers—William Manton from November 14, 1361, to January 31, 1366; William Gunthorpe from February 1, 1366, to February 12, 1368; Thomas Brantingham from February 13, 1368, to June 27, 1369; Henry Wakefield from June 27, 1369, to October 13, 1375; William Moulsoe from October 13, 1375, to November 24, 1376; and Richard Beverley from November 25, 1376, to the king's death on June 21, 1377. Two only of the six attained subsequent distinction, namely, Brantingham and Wakefield. Brantingham, after less than eighteen months of office, was called away to the treasurership of the exchequer and the bishopric of Exeter. Of his career we have spoken elsewhere.¹ Henry Wakefield, though up to 1364 a clerk of the earl of Hereford,² rapidly became much more the king's man than Brantingham, and his six years as keeper of the wardrobe determined the bent of his later activities.

¹ For his career see above, iii. 261.

² *C. Pap. R. Pet.* i. 420.

The king repeatedly pressed for his advance to a bishopric, but it was only after a failure to obtain Ely that he was appointed by the pope to Worcester in 1375. He became, as we have seen, the last treasurer of the reign.

The careers of the remaining keepers were more pedestrian. The one remarkable thing about William Manton is that he had been, from 1340 to 1360, the keeper of the wardrobe of the lady Elizabeth of Clare. Between 1351 and 1360 he had also acted as clerk and receiver of Elizabeth's chamber, thus effecting a union between wardrobe and chamber in the household of a great heiress similar to the subjection of the royal chamber to exchequer control in 1356.¹ Elizabeth died on November 4, 1360, but, as one of the principal executors of his mistress' elaborate testament, Manton was busied in the disposal of her estate.² It was an incident of this charge that he was for a brief time, March 30 to June 26, 1361, made the keeper of the wardrobe of the king's son, Lionel of Antwerp, who had married her granddaughter and heiress. Within five months, Manton was transferred to the king's service as keeper of the wardrobe, and held that post for more than four years. His subsequent history is a blank; probably he soon died.

Manton's successor, Gunthorpe, was a wardrobe clerk of no long standing and of no exceptional parts. A king's clerk since at least 1362,³ he was suddenly elevated to the keepership on February 1, 1366, and held the post until February 12, 1368.⁴ He was then transferred to the less conspicuous post of treasurer of Calais, for which office he accounted between 1368 and 1373.⁵ He was apparently moved to Calais to make room at the wardrobe for Brantingham, who was then treasurer of Calais. But when Brantingham became treasurer of the exchequer, Gunthorpe was not brought back to the wardrobe. He left Calais only on his appointment, on September 26, 1373, as secondary baron of the exchequer.⁶ He remained secondary until

¹ See later, pp. 310-311. Details of his accounts are in *E.A.* 92-95.

² For details see the testament in Nichols' *Royal Wills*, 23-45.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1361-64, pp. 80, 218. He was already presented to livings in the king's gift in 1361; *ib.* p. 53.

⁴ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/10d, 11

⁵ His accounts are in *E.A.* 179/3, 4, 5, 11, and *F. Accts.* 45 Ed. III. 5/F, 46 Ed. III. 6/D, 47 Ed. III. 7/E, F.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1370-74, p. 341.

his voluntary surrender of the post on November 2, 1387.¹ His stages of advancement show the surprising change in the status of offices since the last generation. It was a new thing for a man to begin as head of the wardrobe and end as a baron of the exchequer.

The less obscure of the last two wardrobe keepers of the reign was William of Moulsoe or Mulsho. His name was derived from the Buckinghamshire manor of Moulsoe near Newport Pagnell, of which he was in later life the lord.² He was a friend of William of Wykeham. Under him, Moulsoe acted as surveyor of the king's works at Windsor and elsewhere between 1358 and 1361, when he became Wykeham's successor as clerk.³ In 1364 he followed Wykeham as dean of St. Martin's le Grand.⁴ Moulsoe also shared with Wykeham the credit of being the second founder of that ancient college of household clerks, whose buildings had fallen into decay and whose property had been dissipated during the negligent rule of the sometime treasurer and wardrobe keeper, William Cusance. The ecstatic terms in which Moulsoe recorded how God's grace had raised up a mighty benefactor to the college in Wykeham, who had restored and decorated church and cloister at his own expense in forms of wondrous beauty, speak well for his loyalty to his patron.⁵ He had his reward in his appointment in 1365 as king's chamberlain of the receipt in succession to the dismissed Ralph Brantingham.⁶ He retained

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 361.

² *Ib.*, 1374-77, p. 357, a license to him to alienate Moulsoe in mortmain. His name is always "Mulsho" in the records, but I modernise it according to my practice when the place identification is clear.

³ He was already a king's clerk when he received, on Dec. 25, 1358, his first appointment as surveyor and controller; *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 146. This was renewed on Apr. 28, 1359, when he received 6d. a day wages by the hands of Wykeham; *ib.* p. 194. He succeeded Wykeham as clerk of the works on Nov. 1361; *ib.*, 1361-64, p. 112. His accounts in this capacity between 35 and 39 Edw. III. are in *E.A.* 493/10, 16. Wykeham's own accounts for 33 to 35 Edw. III. are also in *ib.* 493/6, 8.

⁴ Moulsoe held this office until he was succeeded, on Nov. 27, 1376, by Walter Skirlaw; *C.P.R.*, 1374-77, p. 398. Ousefleet, formerly keeper of the great wardrobe, had been dean from 1345 to 1349; *ib.*, 1345-48, p. 548, and *ib.*, 1348-50, p. 305. Cusance was dean from 1349 to 1360, when Wykeham succeeded him.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1367-70, pp. 177-180; *ib.*, 1370-74, pp. 84, 85. Wykeham was chancellor when his office emitted writs so fulsome in the praise of their chief. No doubt an official on the make, like Moulsoe, would not minimise Wykeham's liberality. Yet all was not well, even after Moulsoe's time.

⁶ *Ib.*, 1364-67, p. 93. For Ralph Brantingham's misdeeds, see above, iii. 248-250.

that post until he became keeper of the wardrobe ten years later, in which capacity he served from October 13, 1375, to November 24, 1376, when he died in office.¹ Of his successor, the last keeper of the reign, Richard Beverley, there is nothing to say, except that he was one of a clan of Beverleys then holding offices both about the court² and in the Lancaster household, and that, unlike some of his predecessors, he had had a long wardrobe experience, having been cofferer since 1369.³

The continuity of office comes out more strongly with the subordinate officers, for to the six keepers there were only three controllers, and, as far as we know, two cofferers. Of the latter it need only be said that Brantingham acted from 1359 to 1365, a period including the last occasion of special wardrobe activity abroad. What happened then is not clear, but we know that Beverley served from at least April 1369 to the time when he became keeper in 1376, and although that was a period of almost unprecedented length for this office, he may well have been acting even earlier. The three controllers are more interesting, and it is significant that none of them attained the keepership, although two cofferers were promoted to that dignity over their heads. The financial responsibility of the cofferer seems now to have given more direct experience in qualifying for the keepership than the work of the controller.

Hugh Segrave, clerk, the first of the three controllers, acted from May 26, 1360, to February 12, 1368.⁴ In 1359 he was a king's clerk, and was granted a pension from the exchequer for his long service to the king and queen Philippa, and is then described as remaining in the queen's service.⁵ He fell under the king's direct control when he became controller to the special wardrobe for England to which Ferriby was appointed. He was retained as controller not only when Ferriby became sole wardrobe keeper, but also under Ferriby's successors, Manton and Gunthorpe. When Gunthorpe left the wardrobe, Segrave went too. It is curious that an old servant of the queen should have

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/16.

² The most frequently mentioned are John Beverley, king's esquire, and Robert Beverley, king's clerk. See also below, p. 192.

³ *E.A.* 396/11.

⁴ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 4/7-11.

⁵ *C.P.R., 1358-61*, p. 293. The pension was raised from £20 to £40 after he became keeper; *ib.* p. 462. In 1366-67 he was still specially looking after the queen's interests; *ib.*, 1364-67, p. 286, 441-442.

been acting under Manton, the old servant of another great lady, Elizabeth of Clare. Another example of similar transference was the appointment of John Newbury, clerk, treasurer of queen Isabella up to her death in 1358, as keeper of the great wardrobe, within a few months of that event.¹

When Hugh Segrave ceased to be controller in 1368, he was replaced by two laymen in succession, so that the last years of Edward III.'s reign saw the intrusion of laymen into an office up to this date always served by clerks.² The first of the two was Sir John of Ypres. It was quite in accordance with recent precedents that Ypres should have acquired his administrative experience in other service than that of the crown. As Segrave had served queen Philippa, and Manton had served Elizabeth of Clare and Lionel of Antwerp, so Ypres had been a faithful member of the household of John of Gaunt, and indeed kept up his attachments to his former lord during the nine years and more in which he held two high household posts under the crown. For all the Flemish-sounding name, the Ypres family owned land in Amounderness, the Lancashire hundred between the Ribble and the Lune. John had been a member of the duke's retinue from the time when the king had revived the duchy in his favour. He was nominated by the duke as sheriff of Lancashire in 1361 and 1363.³ In 1367 he had done good service to the duke on the Nájera campaign, and had received knighthood at John's hands on the morning of the great battle.⁴ He had his rewards from his master's bounty, and contracted, on his return to England, to stay with the duke for life in peace and in war.⁵ He was also knight of the shire for Lancashire in the parliaments of 1369 and 1371.⁶ In 1370 and in 1373 he was one of the committee which, in the event of the duke's death, was to have the custody of his lands for the succeeding year.⁷ By 1377, and prob-

¹ See later, ch. xviii. § I.

² Even under the revolutionary government of Simon de Montfort, when a knight, Ralph of Sandwich, became keeper of the wardrobe, the controllers were invariably clerks. See above i. 309-312.

³ P.R.O. *List of Sheriffs*, p. 72; *C.P.R.*, 1361-64, p. 367.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1367-70, p. 297, "to maintain the order of knight which he took from the duke on the day of the battle of Nazare." See also for this, Chandos Herald, lines 3223-3224, who calls him "John d'Ipre a coer fier."

⁵ For his presents from Lancaster, see *John of Gaunt's Register*, ii. 192.

⁶ *Return of Members of Parliament*, pp. 182, 184.

⁷ *Foedera*, iii. 976-977.

ably earlier, he was chief of the duke's council, and on February 20, 1377, on a critical occasion he entertained the duke and other magnates in his London house.¹ By that time he had exchanged the controllership for the stewardship of the household,² a curious and unique promotion at the time. The whole of the remarkable history of John of Ypres shows that an officer of Edward III.'s declining years could serve two masters with impunity.³ Several of his kinsfolk were also attached to the service of Lancaster.⁴

When John of Ypres relinquished the controllership,⁵ he was replaced by William Street, "king's sergeant," who remained controller of the household from November 25, 1376, to June 12, 1377.⁶ Street was humbler in rank and inferior in position to his predecessor. He had, since 1362, been acting as king's

¹ *Chron. Angliae, 1328-58*, p. 123, "apud quendam J. de Ypre qui eos subnixius invitaverat." The somewhat contemptuous expression suggests rather the prejudice and ignorance of the St. Albans chronicler than the obscurity of John of Gaunt's right-hand man. See also Armitage Smith, *John of Gaunt*, p. 153. Mr. Armitage Smith speaks of John of Ypres as a "rich London merchant," but gives no authority for his statement.

² He was controller from Feb. 13, 1368, to Nov. 24, 1376, and steward from July 1376 to the end of the reign. The combination of the two offices in the summer of 1376 needs investigation.

³ This double service was officially recognised by the Good Parliament of 1376, which, in forbidding ministers to take gifts, formally excepted the rights of royal councillors and ministers to take fees and robes from their "lords and masters" (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 322) "sauvez, qe les ditz conseillers, officers, et toutz autres ministres du roi, purront prendre fees et robes de lour seignurs et maistres, et prendre pur lour labour qe ne touche mye lour offices."

⁴ His son, also named John, was a member of the duke's retinue. Another kinsman, Ralph, or Raulyn, of Ypres, figures even more prominently than the controller-steward, in the domestic records of the duke's household. He was in 1372 retained as an esquire of the duke at a heavy fee; he attended, in 1373, John of Gaunt's last expedition to France; was parker of Quernmoor in 1374, and in 1375 bailiff of the hundreds of Lonsdale and Amounderness; *John of Gaunt's Register*, i. 259, 314-315; ii. 52, 249. His fee as esquire was increased by 17½ marks a year, and by a war fee of £20, besides 25 marks a year from the ferm of Liverpool. He received compensation for the loss of a horse in France, when he was on active service. He is described as "nostre bien ame esquier," and his services are highly praised.

⁵ His book for an account ending on June 27, 1369, was handed to the exchequer on April 27, 1370 (*E.A.* 396/11) "hunc librum . . . liberauit hic J. de Ipse, contrarotulator . . . xxvij^o die Aprilis, anno regis xxxxiij^o." The household was at Windsor for the whole time of this account.

⁶ These dates are the extreme limits of his account. He was already acting on Sept. 20, Oct. 7, and Nov. 10, 1376; *C.P.R.*, 1374-77, pp. 341, 372; Nichols, *Royal Wills*, p. 64. As king's butler he was also bound to answer to the king for that office up to Nov. 25 (*C.P.R.*, 1374-77, pp. 443-444), though his successor, Geoffrey Newton, was appointed on Sept. 30; *ib.* p. 352. He continued to act as controller until July 26, 1377; see later, p. 192.

butler¹ or "chamberlain of wines," an office which carried with it the duty of collection, through a crowd of deputies, of the old and new customs on wines in every English port, with special responsibility in the city of London, where the king's butler was ex-officio coroner.² The office of butler had been held by merchants so distinguished as Richard de la Pole and Henry Picard, and involved considerable financial transactions.³ The duties of coroner brought with them a danger of hostile relations with the Londoners, who resented the activity of a coroner who was not "justiciable" to their own courts.⁴ Street was clearly a mere court dependent who received abundant rewards for faithful service.⁵ His close association with a Lancastrian, like John of Ypres, shows how far the court party had become identical with the followers of John of Gaunt.

The double precedent set by Ypres and Street had found such favour, that of the four controllers of Richard II., one only was, after the ancient fashion, a king's clerk. This gradual transference of the controllership into lay hands was the more significant because it came about naturally, and not in response to any demand that clerks should be excluded from the post.

In other directions the lay element in the wardrobe grew apace. Its isolation from the other household departments had been due, to some extent, to the emphasis laid upon the wardrobe as a special preserve for clerks, a *camera clericorum*. But, apart from the "clerks of the offices," the wardrobe seems to have been gradually

¹ He was appointed on May 1, 1361; *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 580. He remained responsible till Nov. 25, 1376; *ib.*, 1374-76, pp. 443-444. It will be remembered that from 1351 to 1360 the king's butler had been accountable at the wardrobe. See above, pp. 132-133. This was before Street's appointment.

² *London Letter Books*, B. viii.-xi., corrected in E. 165-166, and G. 296. Some of Street's accounts as chamberlain survive in *E.A.* 80/15-22. Wine too poor in quality to find a market in London, was, on his certificate, allowed to be exported to Scotland, where consumers seemed less particular or less wealthy; *C.P.R.*, 1364-67, p. 257.

³ For instance, *C.P.R.*, 1374-77, pp. 2-3, where the king promises to pay Street £3648 from a fifteenth recently granted.

⁴ *Rot. Parl.* ii. 367. This was a petition of the Good Parliament, which also complained of the infringement by the marshal and constable of the liberties of the city. But the king would not "depart from his ancient right."

⁵ For instance, two grants of £50 and £40 for life, made from the exchequer in 1362 and 1363, were surrendered for a grant of £90 in Nov. 1376; *C.P.R.*, 1374-77, pp. 365, 373. The office of chirographer of the common bench was granted to Street at the same time; *ib.* p. 372. This was when he became controller.

depleted of wardrobe clerks so described. Thus, in 1368-69, only two *clerici garderobe* are mentioned, namely Thomas Swaby and John Carp.¹ The increasing capacity of the educated layman to undertake functions once entirely reserved for clerks, was a fact quite unrelated to the sporadic waves of anti-clericalism which we have already traced. One result of this development was the confusion of *garderoba* and *hospicium*, which, as we have noticed, began as far back as the latter years of Edward II. The phrase "wardrobe of the household" was used in the exchequer ordinance of 1324, and keeper Waltham called himself "wardrober of the king's household,"² but what was a rarity in the days of Edward II. became customary before the end of the reign of Edward III. Thus, keeper Brantingham was described in his account as keeper "of the wardrobe of the household" and even "treasurer of the household,"³ while Segrave, Ypres and Street were constantly styled "controllers of the household."⁴ Even the chamberlain was sometimes called *camerarius hospicii regis*,⁵ and Richard Beverley was even called "cofferer of the household."⁶ Their more modern successors were so exclusively thus styled that the name wardrobe at last disappeared altogether.

This process involved some widening of the sphere of labour of the clerical officers, but that was balanced by their increasing subordination to their more influential lay colleagues. The result was the gradual breaking down of the traditional dyarchy of the keeper and steward, who slowly ceased to be two colleagues in joint-command. At last the modern "steward's department" was evolved, in which the keepers of the wardrobe, now generally laymen, were definitely subordinated to their sometime colleagues. A similar movement in the chamber enhanced the position of the chamberlain at the expense of the clerical receiver. Examination of this process may be conveniently deferred until we have occasion to treat of the chamber in detail,⁷ but already it had

¹ *E.A.* 396/11. This is, of course, excluding the clerks of the offices and the three chief officers. In this controller's roll of Ypres, I see no reference even to the "ostiarus," at one time quite an important wardrobe clerk.

² See above, ii. 267.

³ "Custos garderobe hospicii," *E.A.* 396/9, 11; "thesaurarius hospicii," *ib.* 396/11. Compare similar designations of Beverley and Pakington in *ib.* 397/5, 400/26.

⁴ "Contrarotulator hospicii nostri"; *E.A.* 392/2, 396/6; *Royal Wills*, p. 64.

⁵ *Foedera*, iii. 911.

⁶ *E.A.* 397/5.

⁷ See later, 337-342.

begun in the later days of Edward III. It was doubtless furthered by the crown's permitting the hereditary chamberlain, the earl of Oxford, to assert a right to exercise authority in chamber affairs, such as the hereditary steward, Thomas of Lancaster, had in vain demanded in the days of the ordainers.¹

We must now say something about the stewardship in the declining years of Edward III., for it is more naturally to be considered in treating of the wardrobe of the household than elsewhere, though the growing importance of the stewardship as a general political office has already compelled some reference to the activities of its occupants.² Between 1359 and 1377 there were six stewards. The first, Guy Brian, was one of the most eminent warriors of the French war, and was literate enough to serve on embassies, even to the papal court at Avignon, and to expound the king's policy to an assembled parliament. His tenure covered the campaign of 1359 and the negotiations of October 1360.

For peace time purposes, a less conspicuous personality than Brian might suffice, and such a one was found in Sir John Lee, who had previously been steward of queen Isabella up to her death in 1358, and then steward of queen Philippa. While still serving the queen, Lee became king's steward in that ambiguous household of Ferriby, in which Philippa's servants mustered so largely.³ But he remained in this office under Ferriby's successors, attesting charters as steward of the king from March 1, 1362, to January 27, 1368.⁴ He devoted himself with energy to making good all the extravagant traditions of his office, pressing his authority as steward to such an extent that he was formally attacked by the commons in 1368. He was accused of having cheated a Dorsetshire man out of the guardianship of a kinsman's lands, and of keeping him under duress until he had surrendered his rights. He had stretched his judicial authority by having various persons, against whom he had a grievance, brought before him, "as if before the king's council. in such places as he pleased and not in the accustomed places." He had imprisoned

¹ See above, ii. 243-245.

² See above, iii. 279, 285-286.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1361-64, pp. 26, 152, shows that he was acting as steward in Oct. and Nov. 1361, when Ferriby was still keeper, and (pp. 217-218) that he attested a patent of Philippa on Apr. 23, 1362.

⁴ For his witness to charters, see *Ch.R.* 146/19 and 157/11.

innocent parties in the Tower, and had caused men to answer in the marshalsea for offences not committed within the verge of the court, and so on. It was concluded that Lee's malpractices could not be excused by law, and he was shut up in the Tower until he had paid fine and ransom at the king's discretion.¹ He was driven from the stewardship, and was succeeded by Sir William Latimer.

Lee's fate did not prevent Latimer from treading in his footsteps. A violent, self-seeking and unscrupulous man, this baron of the fourth generation became, for the rest of the reign, a leader of the extreme court party. His early removal from the stewardship, and his transference to the chamberlainship in 1371, gave him little opportunity of making his mark in the former office, but we have already seen the strong position he had won as chamberlain before his forced removal from that office by the Good Parliament in 1376.² With Latimer, the steward and chamberlain became important elements in the political struggle, for even household policy was now subordinated to the ebb and flow of party strife.

Latimer's successor as steward, Henry Scrope,³ acted for the greater part of 1371, but by November 20, 1371, he had been replaced by John Neville of Raby, a change signifying the preponderance of the Lancastrian courtier party over that of the constitutional baronage. Inevitably Neville became one of the victims of the Good Parliament, but the elevation of John of Ypres from controllership to stewardship, effected early in July, marked the victory of John of Gaunt over the men of the Good Parliament. Ypres acted undisturbed for the short remainder of the reign. Perhaps it is not altogether irrelevant to recall here that in 1318 Thomas of Lancaster claimed, as steward of England, the right to nominate the steward of the household.⁴ Duke John represented a different way of thinking from that of earl Thomas, but it is not fantastic to see in this appointment of the Lancastrian retainer to the household office, another proof of the indestructibility of traditional claims.

The transference of clerks from one government office to another had now become common enough to prove the solidarity

¹ *Rot. Parl.* ii. 297-298.

³ See above, iii. 277, 279.

² See above, iii. 289, 301.

⁴ See above, ii. 243-244.

of the administrative profession. The unity of the service of the crown was emphasised, and the line once existing between the sphere of the household and the sphere of the estate was obliterated. Of old it had been usual to provide for the good wardrobe officer in the higher posts of the exchequer, but now, when promotion from the wardrobe was infrequent, it was becoming a habit to seek in the exchequer for persons suitable for wardrobe office. Up to Edington's time, it is hardly too much to say that the majority of treasurers of the exchequer had first made their mark in the wardrobe. In the last thirty years of the reign, Brantingham and Wakefield were the only treasurers who had ever had wardrobe experience. Wardrobe keepers promoted to the exchequer were Garton, Norwell and Gunthorpe, who became secondary barons; Retford and Brantingham, who became ordinary barons; and Thomas Cross, keeper of the great wardrobe, who became king's chamberlain. John Houton, cofferer in 1328 and 1336, left that important post to become chamberlain of the exchequer, and gradually worked his way through the auditorship and chancellorship to the post of baron, the crown of ten years' exchequer service. Henry Snaith, after being keeper of both great and privy wardrobes, became chancellor of the exchequer. In the latter part of the reign promotion was the other way about, from exchequer to wardrobe. The most striking instance of this is afforded by William Moulsoe, who, at the end of ten years as king's chamberlain of the exchequer, became keeper of the wardrobe. The contrast between his career and that of Cross in the preceding generation speaks for itself. Intermediate is Buckingham, who, beginning his curious career as chamberlain of the exchequer, became keeper of the great wardrobe, then worked his way to the controllership and keepership of the household, and finally, after holding these high wardrobe posts, seemingly contentedly, went back to the exchequer as an ordinary baron. We may compare his history with that of William Rothwell, who went from a chamberlainship of the exchequer to the keepership of the privy wardrobe, and with that of John Hermesthorpe, who did the same in the reign of Richard II.

We find the treasurership of Calais alternately a training school, and a reward, for household service. Of the first six treasurers

of Calais, four had held, or were destined to hold, responsible wardrobe posts. William Shrewsbury served three years at Calais between 1347 and 1350, before he became controller of the wardrobe in the latter year. His two short-lived successors at Calais were the exceptions mentioned, but the next three illustrate our generalisation. The first was Richard Eccleshall, who had been a very active and energetic cofferer for some sixteen years between 1334 and 1350, when he was transferred to the Calais treasury, where he remained for the next ten or eleven years. He was succeeded in 1361 by Thomas Brantingham, who had been cofferer during critical years, and after seven years at Calais, went home to be treasurer of the exchequer. His successor at Calais, Gunthorpe, was transferred from the keepership of the wardrobe for the purpose.¹ With Gunthorpe the close connection between the wardrobe and Calais came to an end. The reason it had ever obtained was that the whole Calais garrison was regarded as a part of the royal household, and that Calais, as the normal seat of the foreign staple and in many other ways, was a pivot in the finances of the crown.

We may now consider the wardrobe finances for 1361-77. Our information is fairly detailed, for there survive enrolled summaries of the accounts for the whole period, and as well particulars for several accounts.² The special features are the

¹ The chronology of the early Calais treasurerships is to be found in their accounts enrolled on the pipe and foreign rolls. See for particulars, *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, xi.; *Enrolled Foreign Accounts*, p. 43.

² The references are as follows: *Enrolled Accounts (W. and H.)*: Manton, 4/7, 7d, 9, 10; Gunthorpe, 4/11, 11d; Brantingham, 4/7d, 19; Wakefield, 4/21, 22, 22d and 5/18; Moulsoe, 5/16, and Beverley, 5/18 and 18d. These make a continuous series. No fresh information is derived from the short documents in *E.A.*, loosely described as "accounts," or "parts of the accounts," of the various keepers. They are single membranes of parchment, all cancelled, and mostly badly preserved. They give no further information than the enrolment affords, and sometimes only specify receipts. They look like the drafts from which the enrolment or part of it was copied. For instances, see for Manton, *E.A.* 394/15, 20, for Gunthorpe, *ib.* 396/1, and for Brantingham, *ib.* 396/9, 10. The only "particulars" of accounts surviving are: (1) *ib.* 396/2, Gunthorpe, Feb. 1, 1366-Feb. 12, 1367, mutilated at the beginning, and incidentally too vaguely described in *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, xxxv.; (2) *ib.* 396/11, Ypres' controller's book for Brantingham's second period, Feb. 13-June 27, 1369; (3) *ib.* 397/5, particulars of Wakefield's second account, June 27, 1371, to June 27, 1373, a very valuable record; and (4) *ib.* 398/9, particulars of Beverley's account, Nov. 25, 1376, to June 21, and, for certain purposes, to July 26, 1377. The varying duration of the accounts involves a good deal of calculation if generalisations are to be attempted, and it is always a question whether it is

remarkable falling off in both receipts and expenses, as compared with the accounts of the war period, and the rough similarity of the totals under the different keepers. Even the renewal of the war in 1369 had only a temporary effect. For a year or two the wardrobe was involved in war finance, but it soon withdrew, and resumed its downward trend.

Some rough calculations may illustrate this point. In the whole peace period of over eight years, 1361 to 1369, the wardrobe turnover was not as great as that of the twenty-one months covered by the wonderful Norwell account of 1338 to 1340. The yearly average for the eight years was little more than £25,000 for the receipt, and considerably less for the expenses.¹ To the expenses must be added the *prestita* and the remnant, which, though entered separately, were added to the expenses before the balance was struck, and calculation was made of the sum of the difference, due from or to the keeper according to whether the balance was in his favour or the king's. Before 1360 it was rarely that there was not a *superplusagium*, or deficit, that is to say, a balance in favour of the keeper as against the king, by reason of the excess of gross expenses over the total receipts. After that year the balance was the other way, and the average year involved a surplus of receipts over expenses of more than three thousand pounds. The *prestita* and "remnants" carried over reduced these apparent balances, but despite this the wardrobe was more than making both ends meet.

In 1369 the renewal of the war seemed at the outset to change the situation. Wakefield's long keepership began at the moment

prudent to follow the accountants in including "prestita" and remnant in the sum of expenses. Fortunately these latter are always separately enumerated. John Uppingham was generally the clerk, and Amery Shirland the baron, employed as auditors.

¹ The exact period is 8 years and a month, but allowance has been made for that. I am indebted to my son, Mr. H. Tout, for the following calculations. Fractions of pounds are neglected.

Date.	Keeper.	Average of Yearly Receipts.	Average of Yearly Expenses.
1361-66	Manton	£24,451	£22,805
1366-68	Gunthorpe	29,422	23,372
1368-69	Brantingham	22,523	15,669

of fresh hostilities, and he remained in office until 1375, when the worst of the fighting was over. The first account which he presented covers two years, from June 27, 1369, to June 27, 1371, and represents a turnover of more than sixty thousand pounds a year. The preamble explains that the account includes "wages of war paid to John, duke of Lancaster, divers earls, bannerets, knights, esquires and others riding for war in the parts of France in the forty-third year." This refers to the ineffective invasion of northern France by John of Gaunt in the autumn of 1369.¹ For the support of this, Wakefield paid £73,934 : 6 : 10 in *vadia guerre* besides *prestita*, mainly *super vadiis guerre*, amounting to £18,850 : 1 : 8 $\frac{3}{4}$. It was, perhaps, a new departure to regard an expedition of the king's son as within the sphere of wardrobe finance, and it does not seem to have been repeated. Wakefield's receipt for the three following years amounts to something short of £19,000 a year, and not all that small income was spent. The period included the chief operations of the war: Pembroke's campaigns in Poitou, and his naval defeat off La Rochelle; the king's last attempt to lead a foreign expedition in person in 1372; and John of Gaunt's long march in 1373 from Calais to Bordeaux. Not even Edward's embarkation with his household seems to have saddled the wardrobe with any war charges.² The only *vadia guerre* claimed by Wakefield between 1371 and 1373 were small sums spent on the wages of war of a ship, conveying a small force from Yarmouth to the Thames, in the autumn of 1372.³ The last two accounts of Wakefield for

¹ The expedition seems to have involved operations on a larger scale, and to have been less futile than is commonly imagined. See *Anon. Chron.* pp. 59-60, and Mr. Galbraith's judicious notes on pp. 173-174, with which I am in entire agreement. The cost confirms Mr. Galbraith's views as to its importance.

² *E.A.* 397/5 shows that Edward was "in nauibus" from Aug. 27 to Oct. 14, attended by his household and holding his "aula" on shipboard; see above, iii. 283. But the only effects shown in the accounts were the large "hospicium" expenditure amounting to £50 a day, and liberal offerings on Oct. 18 to the chief pilgrimage places at Canterbury, visited by the king before he reached his fleet. He then offered 40s. "ad feretrum sancti Thome," and 6s. 8d. each "ad capud eiusdem martiris," "ad ymaginem beate Marie sub volta," "ad punctum gladii," "ad feretrum sancti Augustini," "ad altare sancte Gundrede," "ad altare sancti Winfrid," and "ad locum sancti Gilberti ad postulandum ventum." These come under the heading "elemosyna": the book is not paged.

³ *Ib.* "Nec non de vadiis guerre solutis Hugoni Fastolf et Johanni fratri suo." The details under "vadia guerre" read: "Hugoni et Johanni Fastolf, fratri suo, pro vadiis suis et xxij hominum ad arma, quolibet ad xij d, xvj

1373-74 and 1374-75, though his receipt in the latter account rose to £26,206 for a year and a fortnight, seem substantially free from war charges. At least his expenses, including his prests, were only £20,074, though the balance in his favour was reduced to a *superplusagium* of just under £2000 for the four years. The fact that Wakefield's average charges, with the single exception of his first account, were not much above £20,000 a year, and lower than those of his two predecessors, affords further proof of the slight extent to which war, not waged by the king in person, affected the financial equilibrium of the wardrobe.

The accounts of the successors of Wakefield tell the same tale. They were limited in scope and had the same characteristics. William Moulsoe's only account carried a receipt of £22,733 for more than thirteen months, and his expenses were so nicely adjusted that his *superplusagium* reached only £17 : 9 : 3 $\frac{3}{4}$. The last account of the reign, that of Richard Beverley, had been running for no more than a few months when Edward III. died, but it was anomalously continued for another month to include the expenses of Edward's funeral. Neither of these accounts was, of course, passed until the next reign.

We have made it abundantly clear that the wardrobe had little to do with financing war in the last few years of Edward III.'s reign. Although it is no part of our business to discuss the finances of the branches of the administration on which the main burden now fell, we may observe, while discounting the vague exaggerations of chroniclers ignorant of administrative

hobeliorum, quolibet ad viij d, et xxxviij sagittariorum, quolibet ad vj d, per diem, liijs. viij^d, existencium in quadam magna naui regis, pro saluo conductu eiusdem de portu Magne lernemuthe vsque ad aquam Thamisie, a xxviij^o die Octobris vsque quintum diem Decembris proximum sequentem, anno xlvj^{to} [1372] per xxxix dies, ciiij li. xij s, deductis inde vij li. viij d, pro vadiis ix. hominum ad arma quolibet vacante per ix. dies, et vnus vacantis per tres dies, quatuor hobeliorum, quolibet vacante per quinque dies, et vnus hobelarii, vacantis per duos dies, x sagittariorum, quolibet vacante per viij dies, et vnus sagittarii vacantis per iij dies infra tempus predictum; xxiiij^{ss}. xvij li. xij s. iij^d " Hugh Fastolf was under-admiral to John Neville, " admiral of the fleet towards the north " ; *C.P.R.*, 1370-74, p. 24. As Neville was steward of the household, Fastolf acted for him at sea. John was a king's esquire who apparently helped his brother; *ib.* p. 405. There are no other entries under this head. Then follows a blank leaf, succeeded by a new heading dealing with " hospicium " expenses for the second of the two years of the account.

affairs,¹ that the strain of even ineffective warfare was felt acutely. The brunt of the strenuous efforts made to conduct the war worthily was borne by the exchequer. A cursory examination of the receipt rolls indicates that it gallantly rose to the occasion. Its revenue in some of the critical years exceeded the amount reached in the early days of the struggle. But the history of exchequer revenue under Edward III. has yet to be dealt with satisfactorily, for the well-known investigations of Sir James Ramsay,² while useful and the outcome of immense labour, must be regarded as pioneer efforts, valuable in showing others the way rather than as containing results to be accepted implicitly. Yet to approach so difficult a subject as the amount of national income and expenditure simply as an incident in the study of another subject, would be the height of rashness. For us it is enough to know what a small proportion of the exchequer receipt in these last years of the reign found its way into the wardrobe. Thus, in the years whose figures suggest the highest exchequer receipts, 46, 47 and 48 Edward III., the wardrobe revenue was probably less than a tenth of that of the exchequer, whereas in 1338-40, the wardrobe turnover was greater than that of the exchequer. It is unwise to labour the point, but a more careful examination of the finance of the reign than has yet been attempted is obviously needed. Only when that has been made, shall we be able to determine the measure of the decline of the financial responsibilities of the wardrobe, and the extent of its dependence on the exchequer.

One of the reasons for a reduced exchequer contribution to the wardrobe was that the latter years of Edward saw a remarkable growth in the foreign receipt of the wardrobe. Up to 1359, the foreign receipt of the wardrobe had been steadily dwindling. This shows that the constitutional doctrine of the necessity of all revenue passing through the exchequer was not seriously impugned by the wardrobe. Under Farley and Ferriby, the foreign receipt rose once again, but their accounts are too

¹ We need not accept the statement of the St. Albans annalist, that £900,000 were spent to no purpose in financing the abortive naval expedition of 1372: Walsingham, i. 315, "expensissee quidam testantur eo tempore plusquam novies centum millia librarum in vanum."

² *The Genesis of Lancaster*, ii. 100, Table I., Revenue of Edward III. Sir James' posthumous *Revenues of the Kings of England, 1066-1399*, does not add much to his earlier work.

exceptional to be useful for purposes of comparison. More important is the fact that for the four years and two months of Manton's keepership, a substantial foreign receipt is recorded, averaging about £7500 for the first three years, and reaching £11,419 for the last period of fourteen months. This higher level was maintained under Gunthorpe, whose "foreign receipt" approached 39 per cent of his gross receipt, and was surpassed under Brantingham, when it became 45 per cent of the whole. After that came a decline.

This increase in foreign receipt does not mean that the wardrobe was once more in possession of a large revenue independent of the exchequer. The modest attempts made, earlier in the war, to secure such freedom, had, as we have seen, entirely failed, but the new expansion did not imply a loss of exchequer control, nor a resumption of the position of the wardrobe under Edward I., nor even of that under Norwell, as direct recipient of taxation and loans. Analysis proves that this foreign receipt can be accounted for much more simply.

Part of the explanation is that a change had grown up in the method of wardrobe book-keeping. In the early days of the war, exchequer receipts were divided into receipts *ad receptam scaccarii* and those *ad scaccarium compotorum*.¹ After 1350 the latter heading disappeared,² but the entries formerly made under it were put into the *recepta forinseca*, though their nature was in nowise changed.³ To this extent the consequential increase of "foreign receipt" is, therefore, illusory. Moreover, we must remember that "foreign receipt" generally included the "prests" and "remnant" of the previous keeper, since in the purely personal system of the wardrobe, they could only be entered in the account of a new keeper as part of his "receipt."⁴ In the same way foreign receipt included sums accruing from resales of surplus or deteriorated stock. The value of surplus victuals,

¹ See above, pp. 97-98.

² See above, p. 130.

³ A comparison of Wetwang's "particulars" with his enrolments suggests that, so far as this keeper was concerned, all receipts not derived from the exchequer of receipt were regarded as foreign, but that the exchequer continued to discriminate between receipts from its issuing and from its accounting branch.

⁴ See, for instance, *E.A.* 393/11, where Farley included in his "foreign receipt" £13,647:14:10½, "de domino Henrico de Walton, nuper custode garderobe in diuersis prestitis ab eo receptis nominibus diversorum seruientium hospicii regis et aliorum super vadiis suis guerre." And see below, pp. 171-172.

stores and valuables, handed on to the new keeper, was estimated and recorded as foreign receipt.¹ The wines received from the king's butler, or cloth and the like coming from the great wardrobe, were similarly treated, or if regarded as worthless, entered as *sine pretio*. In short, the only genuine sums of money paid into the wardrobe which could be truly regarded as "foreign" in a non-technical sense were such items as the "profits of the market" or the "pleas of the hall," or the "profits of exchange" derived from foreign currencies being paid for by the wardrobe at one rate and paid out of it, especially to soldiers on foreign service, at a rate of exchange that gave the wardrobe a considerable benefit by the transaction.²

There was, however, another departure, which was the real cause of the swollen foreign receipt, and the new payment to the wardrobe, like the items last mentioned, may be regarded as genuine receipt from non-exchequer sources. This further source of income was the fruit of the amalgamation of the wardrobes and households of the king and queen which, foreshadowed in Ferriby's account, was completed in 1363, and was one of the most novel of the administrative experiments of this period. Philippa's estates were still controlled separately, but her receiver, Richard Ravenser, was ordered to pay £10 a day to the king's wardrobe for the support of the joint household of the royal pair. Thus extra-exchequer revenue of £3650 a year, or £3660 in leap year, was acquired for the wardrobe, and continued until Philippa's death on August 15, 1369.³

¹ These were not novelties. Compare Buckingham's "recepta forinseca" in 1353-54; *E.A.* 392/12. The gross amount of this was £4381:11:2½, of which no less than £3972:15:2½ came from Retford's "remnant" and the value of the stores he left behind him. In using the totals of the wardrobe accounts to compare its income, year by year, such items are necessarily reckoned twice over at least, and therefore we exaggerated somewhat the wardrobe's true income. But the difference this exclusion would make is slight enough to justify our not dissecting wardrobe figures too precisely.

² Wetwang's account (see above, pp. 115-119) included £3281:7:0 from this source: "de auantagio proueniente de 196,081 florinis aureis de scuto receptis de diuersis ad iijs. iiij*d.*; et solutis diuersis in garderobera predicta ad iijs. viij*d.*" It is unlikely that Edward's subjects appreciated this method of payment.

³ For the preliminary stage under Ferriby, when still larger sums were transferred to the king's wardrobe, see above, pp. 149-150. This may account for a slight excess in Manton's first account, when he received £3795:15:10, "super expensis hospicii regine." The bargain was kept pretty strictly after its conclusion in 1362. Thus, we have £3650 in Manton's third account, and his fourth account's record of £4440 is explained by its covering two and a half

A few illustrations of other items comprised in the "foreign receipt" in the period under examination may be given. Manton's receipt of 1364-66 included the large "remnant" of £1140 : 7 : 2 from William Street, the king's butler ; of £3150 : 9 : 0 from Henry Snaith, clerk of the great wardrobe, as the value of wax, spices and other commodities supplied to the household ; and the modest credit of £10 : 18 : 0 to the treasurer of Calais for twelve barrels of salt eels for the use of the household. Gunthorpe's large proportion of "foreign receipt" ¹ contained the following items : from Street, the king's butler, for profits of the butlery, £1561 : 9 : 4 ; from Manton's "remnant" and for victuals paid for by him, £1254 : 5 : 9½ ; and from Snaith for great wardrobe supplies, £1143 : 15 : 8. These sums, with Ravenser's subvention, made up £7609 out of the total foreign receipt of £10,688. The smaller items are not interesting, but it is curious to note that the payment for twelve barrels of salt eels was again the only contribution to the household revenue from Calais, while the receipt of £118 : 6 : 0 from the collectors of customs and subsidies shows how insignificant an amount of ordinary revenue flowed directly from the tax gatherer to the wardrobe.²

A year later Brantingham's account showed similar items. Besides Ravenser's payment, there were small receipts from Ponthieu and Gascony, the latter for wine for the troops there. In Brantingham's second and broken account, when foreign receipts were much higher than exchequer receipts, the three chief items of £1854 from Street, £1350 from Ravenser, and £2457 for remnant and victuals, amount to within £250 of the whole foreign receipt of £5903. The other items remained much as before, and Street bore himself nobly as a source of income, contributing to Wakefield's account for the two wardrobe years 1371-73, £3214, or nearly half the foreign receipt of £6490 for

months over a year. Gunthorpe's receipts of £3650 and £3770 are right, as his second account was over the year. Brantingham's £3660 in 1368 is explained by leap year. Wakefield received £480 in his first account, but Philippa died on the fiftieth day after its commencement.

¹ *E.A.* 396/1.

² *Ib.* 396/1. One minor item gives a good illustration of the judicial functions of the steward, extending to hanging criminals and disposing of their property : "Et in precio argenti defraacti, per dominum J. de la Lee, senescallum hospicii regis, in garderobera restituti in xliiij peciis, post suspensionem Petri Say, pro furacione dicti vesselamenti suspensi."

the same period. Street had certainly earned his promotion to the controllership of the office which he had financed so extensively. The other half of Wakefield's foreign receipt was made up of small sums, including a minute payment of £36 : 13 : 4 from Gunthorpe, now treasurer of Calais.¹

Despite such occasional inflations, the "foreign receipt" soon lost all elasticity. With Philippa's death, on the eve of the renewal of war, the real source of increased supplies dried up. It is significant that no fresh foreign receipt arose from war conditions. During the two first years of Wakefield, the foreign receipt was only four per cent of his augmented revenues, and for the rest of the reign it was no more important than in the middle period. Thus the exchequer remained triumphant at the end. All the real money, which the wardrobe could command or direct, came from the exchequer only, with the most trivial exceptions. And of this money the wardrobe was the accountant rather than the disburser.

Let us turn from wardrobe receipts to wardrobe expenses. Their study brings out strongly the way in which the activity of the office was now restricted to household work. For every year the expenses of the household, plus the insignificant statutory alms, form the one great element of outgoings. These expenses were as high, if not higher, than they had been earlier in the reign, despite the quieter and less mobile life which the king now lived. No doubt the rise in prices resulting from the war is a partial explanation of this, but we cannot resist the impression that stringent economy was exercised to keep them down to a level that would roughly balance with the income received. The *hospicium* expenses of the Farley-Ferriby dual control were quite exceptional. After that the demands of the household fell off, for in Manton's first year, 1361-62, they were only £13,226. The union between the king's and the queen's households now effected, naturally tended to increase expenses in the following years. For the rest of Manton's office they fluctuated between £17,000 and £18,000. Under Gunthorpe the average was about the same. Brantingham, however, only spent £11,265 for 1368-69, though his charge of £4345 for a little less than four months in 1369

¹ *E.A.* 397/5. Street's payments included £1482:18:0, the price of 189 "dolia" of Gascon wine.

indicates a slightly higher rate. The death of Philippa should have lessened the burdens of the widower's household, but Wakefield's record showed only a small reduction over Manton and Gunthorpe, and was higher than that of Brantingham. For the six years and more, between June 1369 and October 1375, his average yearly expenses were over £16,000. This sum was reduced under Moulsoe, who spent just under £15,000 in a little over thirteen months. Beverley's brief account is useless for comparison, for it was continued into the next reign so as to include Edward III.'s heavy funeral expenses.¹ On the whole we are struck with the uniformity of these expenses under varying conditions.

None of the *hospicium* figures leave much over for *expensa forinseca* in the restricted wardrobe incomes of the time. Let us take, as one instance, Gunthorpe's first account, 1366-67. Here the payments under the customary *tituli*, or categories, are cut down to a low figure. The aggregate is less than £5400, and the only important item is for the king's and queen's *necessaria*, which amount to slightly more than £4000.² Part of the reduction is doubtless due to the increasing tendency to transfer to the exchequer the charge for wages and maintenance that had once figured so prominently in wardrobe accounts. Nor must we overstress the modesty of the figures, for to ascertain the actual cost of the court, we must add to them the burden of such departments as the chamber, the great wardrobe, the king's works and their like, now separately financed from the exchequer.³ Except the chamber, all these offices were now as

¹ Among the items are: "Roberto Chaundeler . . . pro diuersis custubus ad custodiendum corpus regis a putrefactione"; "pro imagine ad similitudinem regis . . . ante diem sepulture," for 7511 lbs of wax candles. The "hospicium" expenses amounted to £791:5:1½ for the three days of the funeral ceremonies; *E.A.* 398/9. We must add to these the huge liveries of great wardrobe commodities for the funeral detailed in *ib.* 397/20.

² The exact figures in *E.A.* 396/1 are: "oblaciones regis et regine" £148:3:8; "dona" £493:4:1; "cursores regis et regine" £30:17:3; "necessaria regis et regine" £4068:17:5; "vadia venatorum et putura leporariorum regis" £100:7:0½; "feoda et roba" £304:1:7. The total is £5391:0:3½, while "hospicium cum elemosinis statutis" amounts to £17,545:4:10. It is interesting that wages, at some times so important a source of expense, are now cut down to those of the king's huntsmen.

³ The last two statements are strikingly illustrated, so early as 1362-63, in the documents published by Miss Broome and myself in *E.H.R.* xxxix. 412-419. The expenses of the exchequer are very largely those which in earlier times would have passed through the wardrobe accounts.

much national as domestic in scope. The privy wardrobe in particular was in no real sense household.

None of these extraordinary charges did much to raise the exceedingly low level of wardrobe income and liabilities for these years. If the accusations of extortion and venality, so freely brought against the dominant courtier faction, had much substance, care at least was taken to exclude much evidence of it from the wardrobe accounts. On the face of it, the declining years of Edward III. suggest a more successful effort towards realising the ideal that the king should "live of his own," than had, as yet, been witnessed.

The amalgamation of the queen's wardrobe with that of the king is evidence of an effort in the direction of efficiency and consolidation. We have already spoken of the effect of this in swelling the foreign receipt of the king's wardrobe, and we shall have something to say later about the household of queen Philippa as well as of that of her mother-in-law, queen Isabella, after her fall from power. At present it is enough to record that, with all her virtues, Philippa was far from being a thrifty housewife. She had for years been running deeply into debt. Not only was she unable to maintain her state and meet her liabilities, but she failed to control her own ministers and purveyors, and to protect herself from the malversations of her agents. It was to no purpose that commissions were appointed to hear and determine such complaints.¹ An additional grant to her of lands worth £2000 a year did not give much relief.² Perhaps further remedy was sought in the appointment of the active chancery clerk, Richard Ravenser, as her receiver and attorney in 1359.³ Ravenser had already been acting receiver to queen Isabella, and had succeeded in liquidating her debts by his careful administration of her estates in the year succeeding Isabella's death in 1358. Ravenser at once began to pay large sums of his receipts on Philippa's account into the king's wardrobe.⁴ But the situation had not improved when, in 1362, the commons specially complained of the abuses of the queen's purveyors. Edward was

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1354-58, pp. 451, 613; *ib.*, 1358-61, p. 323.

² *Ib.*, 1358-61, pp. 237-239.

³ Besides being receiver for the two queens, Ravenser had also been made keeper of the hanaper in 1357; *Pipe*, 203/41 (32 Edw. III.).

⁴ For the first fruits of his efforts see above, pp. 149-150.

forced to yield to their insistence,¹ and made himself responsible for Philippa's debts.² He released her from the obligation of "paying all prests made to her from the exchequer and elsewhere and from all accounts, farms and debts for which she was bound to the king."³

At last, on February 8, 1363, an ordinance of king and council completed the long process of experiment. It laid down that all the issues and profits of lands and other property, held by Philippa in dower or for life, should be reserved for a period of six years to be devoted to the payment of her ancient debts. This period was to begin retrospectively with Michaelmas 1362. Ravenser, still queen's receiver, was to be in charge of the fund, and, with two exceptions, was to apply the proceeds of it to paying her debts. The exceptions were the £10 a day which were to be paid "to the treasurer of the household of the king and his consort" in aid of household expenses, and that four thousand marks a year, which were to be delivered to Philippa "for the expenses of her chamber," that is, for her own personal and private expenses.⁴ We must recognise in this ordinance the first fruits of Manton's keepership. The effect was to bring to an end the queen's household as a separate institution, putting in its place a joint household of king and queen under the direction of the king's officers. There is no evidence that, when the six years' term expired in September 1368, there was any attempt at reconstituting the queen's household on an independent basis. The death of Philippa in August 1369 prevented any later attempt in that direction. The queen's dying request that her husband should fulfil her still outstanding obligations, and carry out her bequests to churches and her servants, showed that, even after the lapse of six years, the hopes of the reformers of 1362-63 had not been realised.⁵

A more complete explanation of the decreasing activity of the wardrobe is to be found in the change of the king's habits, which was already beginning in the period after the treaty of

¹ See above, iii. 257, 258.

² *Foedera*, iii. 687, assumes that this had already taken place before Feb. 1363.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1361-64, p. 249.

⁴ The writ of Feb. 8 is printed in *Foedera*, iii. 657, and summarised in *C.P.R.*, 1361-64, p. 306.

⁵ Numerous entries in Brantingham's *Issue Roll* of 1369-70 suggest that Edward loyally carried out his wife's last wishes.

Calais, was increasing during the last years of the peace and queen Philippa's life, and became more accentuated after 1369. In his prime Edward had been the most active and restless of kings. Apart from his long continental journeys, and his constant expeditions to the north, he had been always on the move, even when remaining within the limits of his own kingdom. Wherever he went, his household and wardrobe attended him, and were consequently as peripatetic as their master. But Edward's habits now gradually changed into those of a recluse, and the decline of his strength compelled him to adopt the sedentary ways of an invalid. His last effort to undertake expeditions abroad had proved a sorry failure, and there was no longer any need for him to show himself in Scotland, or watch from some northern centre the fortunes of the Scottish monarchy, independent beyond the Tweed.

The result was that Edward remained almost exclusively in southern England, and seldom deserted his favourite castles and manors in the home counties. The houses, which he himself had rebuilt or amplified, were his chosen abodes, and the details of his constructions can be drawn from the copious surviving accounts of the clerks of his works. Foremost among them was Windsor castle, and, near it, his manor in Windsor park, to which he often retired for greater quietude or to enjoy its facilities for sport. Next to it came Sheen, the Richmond of Tudor and later times; Berkhamsted and Langley, the homes of his youth, which he occupied even after they had been handed over to his sons, Edward and Edmund; Eltham, a much loved abode; and Havering-atte-Bower in Essex, endeared to him as the favourite manor of queen Philippa. Westminster saw him seldom publicly, except for parliaments and solemn functions, and London and the Tower hardly ever. Wherever he was, he kept up little of the splendid state of his prime, a circumstance which helped his household officials to balance their accounts. There were still high revels at the chief feasts of the church, and on national feasts, such as St. George's Day, April 23, which was always celebrated at Windsor. But these were exceptions to the general monotony of the old king's life.

At the same time that the machinery of state was becoming, as we have seen, more and more concentrated at Westminster,

a similar, though less clearly accentuated, tendency towards stabilisation was beginning to affect the household. Just as chancery and king's bench were settling down at Westminster, so the chief household offices were beginning to establish themselves in semi-permanent headquarters. Administrative convenience had, as we have seen, often brought the wardrobe, or part of it, to Westminster, not only during the king's visits but at other times, notably for the arrayment of the account under the eyes of the exchequer. Thus in 1346, when the wardrobe was following the king in the Crécy-Calais campaign, we find the exchequer paying for the erection of a "house" within the palace of Westminster as the office of the controller of the wardrobe.¹ We now find the household as a whole settled down for long periods at the king's favourite resting-places, notably at Windsor castle. The result was a separation between the king and the household, similar to, though less complete than that already successively effected between the king and his chancery, his judicial benches and his privy seal. There followed also a new distinction which became recognised in the later household records of this reign, the distinction, namely, between the *hospicium regis* and the *familia* or the *intrinseca, secreta*, or *priuata familia regis*. In earlier times *hospicium regis* and *familia regis* had been substantially synonymous. Now there had arisen a sharp distinction between them. While the *hospicium* became more stationary, the king still moved within a restricted area, but accompanied only by his *priuata familia*. The *hospicium* became more public, while the *familia* remained intensely personal. Thus William Wykeham was specially continued as a member of the *intrinseca familia regis*, even when keeper of the privy seal,² and in 1360, when Edward hurried home from Brétigni, leaving his *hospicium* to follow at its leisure the march of the army to Calais, he took with him from Honfleur to Rye his *secreta familia*.³

This development must be particularly borne in mind, since

¹ *I.R.* 336.: "Thome Carpenter de London. in persolucionem L. marcarum sibi liberandarum pro factura cuiusdam domus infra palacium Westmonasterii pro officio contrarotulatoris de garderoba regis per breue . . . xxxiiij li vj s. viij d.

² See above, iii. 238-239. Not only the issue roll, but the allowance for fees and robes to Wykeham in *E.A.* 392/2, f. 11 shows this.

³ See above, iii. 227, and iv. 141.

there arises from it a new complication in the difficult problem of determining the royal itinerary. We have seen that from the late thirteenth century the wanderings of the chancery gradually ceased to be a safe indication of the movements of the sovereign. During the reign of Edward III. we see that the privy seal, which had followed pretty closely the steps of Edward I., had become largely separated from the sovereign, though it accidentally happened that, at this particular time, the old connection of king and privy seal had been restored by Wykeham. To counterbalance this, in Edward III.'s later years, the itinerary of the household was one thing, and the itinerary of the king was another.

For the future, in determining the royal itinerary, we must be cautious in accepting the evidence of the wardrobe. Great attention must be paid to "secret" or "private" visits, which are often revealed to us in the titles *elemosina* and *dona* where the personal presence of the king is proved at places where the *hospicium* clearly was not. By combining such evidence with the records of the privy seals, we may make out a fairly complete personal itinerary of the king. Our inquiry is facilitated by the helpful practice of the chancery clerks in giving as the date and place of a chancery writ, the date and place of the writ of privy seal by which the chancery writ was warranted.¹ Accordingly the chancery places and dates of writs, warranted by privy seal, are subsequent in date and different in place from the originating document which it copied. This habit explains why, in the years we are now discussing, a certain number of letters, warranted by privy seal, appear intercalated with Westminster writs of the same date. The information thus given suggests that Edward III. was much more mobile than he seems, and that he was not infrequently at Westminster.

The process was worked out in the years of the peace. A comparison between Edward's movements before and after 1360

¹ *C.W.* afford material for this, and can be readily checked by *C.P.R.*, 1364-1367, pp. 211-371; *C.P.R.*, 1364-68, pp. 213-315; and *C.F.R.* vii. 324-345. I have found only one writ for this year (40 Edw. III.) in each of the calendars, which is issued elsewhere than from Westminster, with the important exception of the writs warranted by privy seal. When writs were issued from Westminster "by privy seal," my inference is that the king and seal were at Westminster at the time. We must not forget the stress laid in the issue rolls on Wykeham remaining "*de intrinseca familia regis.*"

will best illustrate it. Let us, for the earlier period, take Buckingham's wardrobe account for the year February 1353 to January 1354.¹ In it we shall see the household moving constantly with the king, both in a more restricted circle, but still changing quarters, after the restless mediaeval fashion, every few days. Between February and June the king and his household did not move very far, but stayed in turn at Thurrock, Stratford-le-Bow, Mortlake, Eltham (for Easter), Chertsey, Windsor (for St. George's Day), Thurrock (for Whitsuntide), and even for two days at Westminster on June 5 and 6. Then the king and household went on a south-western tour, halting at Kingston, Guildford, Alton, Winchester and Salisbury for a longer sojourn at Clarendon (July 31 to August 10), and thence by Warminster, Malmesbury, Cirencester, Gloucester (August 19), Winchcomb, Chipping Camden, Banbury and Northampton (November 1). From Northampton they proceeded by slow stages through Newport Pagnell, Dunstaple, St Albans, Barnet and Stratford to Eltham, where Christmas was passed. With a new year came a visit to the eastern counties, as far as Newmarket and Bury St. Edmunds. This is fairly illustrative of the royal habits when Edward was in England in the later stages of the war.

Thirteen years later, 1366-67, the royal movements, as revealed in Gunthorpe's first wardrobe account,² were very different, and the frequent separation between the *hospicium regis* and the household had become marked. The household ceased to be constantly on the move. We find it on February 1, 1366, established at Windsor, where it remained till July 24. Then it removed to Havering, where the queen had gone earlier, and stayed there from July 25 to September 10. From Havering it went back to Windsor as to a sort of winter quarters, spending one night on the way at Clerkenwell, and continuing at Windsor from September 12 to January 31, 1367, when the account ended. In a whole year, then, the household had been stationed in only two places, both about twenty miles from Westminster.

Meticulous scrutiny of Gunthorpe's account tells us that Edward, accompanied only by his *privata familia*, was so often at Westminster that it was worth while to lay up a store of forty

¹ *E.A.* 392/12.

² *Ib.* 396/2; it is from Feb. 1, 1366, to Jan. 31, 1367.

pipes of Gascon wine for the "private cellar" of the king at Westminster for his "secret visits" there.¹ Such visits, often of a day or two's duration, took place in February and in early March 1366, on Edward's way to and from Sheppey. There was a longer and more ceremonious visit in May, where on May 4 Edward opened, and on May 11, dismissed, a representative parliament.² Other visits are suggested in July, between September 28 and October 19, and on four other occasions before the end of the year of account. Only less frequent were Edward's visits to Sheen and Sheppey, where Queenborough castle was his normal resting-place, and a store of wine was provided at both for the occasions when the king arrived there "privately without his officials."³ As a half-way house between Sheen and Windsor, there was Chertsey, where the king and queen were in June, July, October and December, and where they celebrated All Saints Day on November 1, 1366.⁴ The king's manor in Windsor park was an occasional place of retirement.⁵ The end of January and early February 1367 were spent at King's Langley and at Moorend castle in Northamptonshire,⁶ doubtless for hunting. Longer excursions were made to Sheppey, visited in February, March, May, June, September and December 1366.⁷ On the way to and from, Edward visited Burstead (Billericay) and Hadleigh in Essex,⁸ and Leeds, Gravesend and Eltham in Kent. His only prolonged expeditions were made in the summer of 1366 to the New Forest, where his presence, between later July and early

¹ *E.A.* 392/2, f. 81. "In precio xl doliorum vini vasconici, hospitati in priuato salario regis apud Westmonasterium pro secretis aduentibus regis ibidem."

² *Rot. Parl.* ii. 289-291.

³ *E.A.* 392/2, f. 82. "In precio quinque doliorum et unius pipe vini vasconici, expenditi in mora regis existentis priuate sine officiariis suis apud Shene et Shepey." Edward was at Sheen on July 9 and on Jan. 5, 1367; *ib.* ff. 60, 81.

⁴ *Ib.* 396/2, ff. 59, 60. Mass was celebrated at Chertsey abbey "in presenciam regis et regine," whose offertory amounted to 5s. 5d. This was probably a day excursion. Thomas of Woodstock, and other junior members of the royal family, stayed at Windsor and heard mass at St. George's chapel.

⁵ *Ib.* f. 82. "Pro expensis regis in secretis aduentibus suis ibidem."

⁶ *Ib.* f. 58. On Feb. 2, the feast of the Purification, Edward offered 5 gold nobles "ad magnam missam in capella sua de Moresend," and, on the same day, Philippa 5 gold crowns "in capella sua infra castrum de Wyndesores."

⁷ *Ib.* 396/2, f. 62, records on June 2 a gift to a ferryman for taking the "familia regis" over the Medway. This must be meant for "priuata familia," I suppose. In a similar loose way the "great wardrobe" and "wardrobe of the household" are sometimes confused.

⁸ *Ib.* f. 82. "Pro expensis regis apud castrum de Hadle."

September of that year, is revealed at Tytherley, Clarendon, Breamore, Brockenhurst, Beaulieu, Corfe, Cranbourne and Dinton,¹ and to these we must add long stays at Windsor and Havering with the household.

Under such conditions, there was more need than ever for household officers to be "out of court." They had not only to seek money and supplies for the stationary *hospicium regis*, not only to attend councils and other administrative assemblies at Westminster, or to pursue their own private affairs; they had also to be "out of court" because they had to follow, or to visit, the king. In official language "out of court" meant outside the household, and now the king with his *priuata familia* was himself often "out of court." Gunthorpe, for example, was constantly running from Windsor and Havering to London to seek for money,² and Lee the steward was *extra curiam* for 149 days.

Another result of the change was the multiplication of small wardrobes in various places which the king or queen were likely to visit. Thus we have a royal wardrobe in 1366 at Hadleigh, a permanent establishment with a keeper paid sixpence a day, half from the exchequer and half from "elsewhere," which must mean the wardrobe.³ There was a similar establishment at the same rate at Leeds castle in Kent,⁴ which Edward seldom visited in these years. Ten years later, the wardrobe keeper at Leeds was old enough to receive a modest corrody by way of pension.⁵ Besides these local wardrobes, king's yeomen were constantly kept behind, or sent forward, to guard some portion of the royal wardrobe, which might travel with the king, or precede or follow him. Often such a sectional wardrobe was the insignificant

¹ *Ib.* f. 73. Between Aug. 16 and 29, Gunthorpe was sent to Cranborne from Havering for 7 days "ad conducendum argentum regis tempore venationis. Compare *ib.* f. 80. Philippa, I expect, remained at Havering, and the household with her. Hunting was apparently both a summer and winter pursuit in the fourteenth century. The "elemosina" and "dona" "tituli" suggest pretty constant wandering of the king and his "priuata familia," but one is puzzled sometimes whether the dates represent the dates of the services rendered or of the payments.

² *Ib.* 392/2, m. 73. "Pro denariis querendis." His absences were January to March, 11 days; April to May, 11 days; June, 7 days, 4 days "versus consilium regis pro denariis querendis"; July to August, 12 days; September, 16 days; October to December, 19 days. Total absences, 75 days.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1364-67, p. 310.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 313.

⁵ *Ib.* 1374-77, p. 535.

garderoba robarum, and it is interesting to know that, although Philippa's wardrobe was amalgamated with her husband's, she still had a separate *garderoba robarum* of her own.¹

The king's health was now weakened and the queen's last hour was approaching. In 1369 the household remained at Windsor for the whole of the four months of John of Ypres' counter-roll, the last on which the expenses of Philippa figured. On it appeared the fees, robes and wages of John of Hinesthorp, keeper of her privy seal; of Master Peter of Florence, her physician; and of John Mills, "the clerk writing for the queen's seal."² But the skill of Peter of Florence no longer availed and Philippa died at Windsor on August 15. It was doubtless her fatal illness which kept the court at Windsor for all that time, though Edward himself was in great need of medical care. Between February 13 and May 9 his physician, John Glaston, was nine days out of court "for preparing medicine for the king's body."³ Nor did he improve. Between June 1371 and July 1372, Glaston was sixty-seven days out of court on the same quest.⁴ Nevertheless the king showed greater activity now than he had during his wife's last months, and for eighteen months after the queen's death he avoided Windsor, spending much more time at Westminster.⁵

In the accounts of Wakefield for June 1371 to June 1373⁶

¹ *E.A.* 396/11, f. 76. "Laurencio Lok pro vadiis suis extra curiam, moranti apud Wyndesores post recessum familie versus Haveryng, custodienti garderobam regine." This was from June 27 to Sept. 12, at 3d. a day. The entry clearly refers to her "*garderoba robarum*," a wardrobe in a more modern signification. Even Philippa's "camera," which was her own office, had to be guarded at Windsor from June 23 to Sept. 12, after the "*familia*" had moved to Havering. Compare f. 80, where Robert of Kirklington was sent "*cum garderoba regis*" from Windsor to Clarendon and divers other places, between June 2 and Sept. 12. Portage of the same wardrobe cost 1s., so it was not very large. This too was the movable "*garderobarobarium*." The "*hernesia garderobe robarum*" was moved from Havering to Westminster and Sheen "*extra curiam*" for 40 days, between Aug. 20 and Oct. 31; *Ib.* f. 81. ² *Ib.* 396/11.

³ *Ib.* 396/11. "Johanni de Glaston, phisico reges, misso extra curiam pro medicinis preparandis pro corpore regis." His allowance was 3s. 4d. a day.

⁴ *Ib.* 397/5.

⁵ I infer this from the evidence of the accounts and privy seals, combined with that afforded by the chancery rolls. For instance, the large file of privy seals between December 1369 and April 1370 in *E.A.* 396/13 are all dated Westminster, and the patent rolls only suggest a summer visit to Clarendon, besides the ordinary suburban sojourns. Eltham was now more often visited than Havering. Henley, near Guildford, and Rotherhithe manor now occur frequently.

⁶ *Ib.* 397/5.

we find Edward still stationary for long periods, being at Windsor between July 11 and August 10, 1371; at Eltham from September 16, 1371, to April 17, 1372; and at Windsor from April 18 to July 31, keeping his household with him after the ancient fashion. This was the year of the king's last project for going abroad with his army. After eleven days at Eltham in early August, he moved slowly through Kent to Sandwich. Between August 27 and October 14, the household was *in nauibus*, and the appointment, on August 31, of the infant Richard of Bordeaux as regent involved the old division of the ministry. This did not last long, for nothing came of the expedition, and the king was once more alternately at Sheen and Windsor, until he went to Eltham for Christmas.¹ These conditions obtained for some little time. The king was still able to visit famous churches and to take his pleasure in hunting. Councils were constantly held at Westminster, and absence from the household was now imperative among its chief officers, if they were assiduous in their political duties. This was specially so with the lay officers and notably with the steward. Thus, in five months of 1371 Henry Scrope was out of court for seventy-seven days out of a hundred and forty-six.² His successor, John Neville, was appointed on November 20, but out of the two hundred subsequent days he was only in court for eight.³ William Latimer, again, was absent ninety days for the same reason,⁴ at Westminster, where the king's "private cellar" was now available for the use of his councillors.⁵

Wardrobe accounting under Edward was never as dilatory as under Edward II. From time to time, for some particular reason, delays did occur, but on the whole the accounts were audited with fair punctuality, and arrears were not allowed to accumulate.

¹ *Ib.* 397/12.

² *Ib.* 397/5. He was "extra curiam penes consilium" for that period between June 27 and Nov. 20.

³ *Ib.* 397/5. "Johanni de Nevill, senescalco . . . pro expensis suis extra curiam existenti penes consilium, inter diem xx^m Nov. et diem xxviii^m Jun. per^{co} iixij dies."

⁴ *Ib.* Willelmo Latimer . . . pro expensis suis extra curiam existenti penes consilium."

⁵ *Ib.* 397/5. "In precio lx doliorum vini . . . in secreto selario regis apud Westmonasterium et expendorum in secretis aduentibus suis per ipsum regem et consilium suum."

The last years of the reign were perhaps the least satisfactory from this point of view. Accounting was postponed in fact, although not in appearance. For instance, Wakefield's accounts for his first four years, 1369 to 1373, seem all to have been made up at the same time, though set forth in two separate accounts, each of two years.¹ The death of William Moulsoe in office caused similar postponement, which was lengthened by the death of the king seven months later. The result was that neither Moulsoe's nor Beverley's accounts were delivered to the exchequer until the next reign, and then involved a period of 248 days' work, during which the clerks of Beverley and Street were busily engaged upon the arrayment.²

We have already drawn largely on the last wardrobe account of the reign, in which Richard Beverley summarised the expenses and movements of the court from November 25, 1376, until a month after the king's death. Edward was dangerously ill at Havering early in 1377, but on February 11 was moved to Sheen by water.³ He was well enough to receive there a parliamentary deputation, although the great feast at the end of the session, while charged to wardrobe account, could not have been graced by his presence. He was again removed to Windsor for the feast of St. George on April 23, but that was to glorify the rising sun of the young prince of Wales. The king at once

¹ *E.A.* 397/5. "Clericis scribentibus libros compoti garderober de iiij annis precedentibus tam pro expensis hospicii quam pro guerra, xl l." Of the two books of "particulars" compiled, only one, dealing with the latter years 1371-73, has survived.

² *Ib.* 398/9. "Ricardo de Beuerlee custodi . . . pro expensis suis propriis et clericorum suorum ac clerici contrarotulatoris eiusdem hospicii, et aliorum officiariorum hospicii secum morancium et existencium super arraiacione et redicione tam compoti ipsius regis quam compoti Willelmi de Mulso, nuper custodis, et etiam in recompencione laborum et sumptuum per ipsum Ricardum factorum circa funeralia et sepultura dicti aui, per cclviij dies quibus diebus iidem Ricardus et clerici predicti extiterunt circa arraiacionem et redicionem predictorum compotorum ad custus ipsius Ricardi inter diem xxvij^m Julii, anno regis Ricardi primo, et ix^m diem Julii, anno tercio." The beginning was made, with admirable promptitude, the day after Beverley left office. But the 248 days were scattered over nearly two years. See also *M.R.K.R.* 156, 3 Ric. II. breu. dir. bar. Trin. t. (mm. xxiiij-xxviijd); and *M.R.K.R.* 158, 5 Ric. II. breu. dir. bar. Mich. t. (mm. ix-ixd). The order to inspect Beverley's account, and to inform the king in the privy seal office of the names of his debtors, was dated June 11, 1380. It was in order to discharge the debts "en discharge de l'alme de nostre ael avant dit." There was a similar entry for Moulsoe's account in *ib.* mm. xxv-xxvii.

³ See above, iii. 318.

went back to Sheen, dying there, as we already know, on June 21.

During this short time the household seems to have been permanently stationed at Windsor, only removing to Sheen after the king's death. The chief officers generally were out of court. In a period of 210 days, Ypres, now steward, was *extra curiam* for 180 of them, busy no doubt in furthering the interests of John of Gaunt, his real master. Beverley himself was absent 75 days and controller Street for 95, but Carp, the cofferer, was away only 22 days. There was little interest in the daily task; Moulsoe's accounts had not been presented: money was being spent sparingly. Thus tamely ended the wardrobe of the household in a reign at the beginning of which it had been so vigorous and resourceful; but the machine remained, and was still capable of being refurbished. Normally, however, it had ceased to be the second treasury and the second chancery it had been earlier under Edward III.

CHAPTER XII

THE WARDROBE OF THE HOUSEHOLD UNDER RICHARD II

THE tendencies in wardrobe history already manifested in the later part of the reign of Edward III. expressed themselves with even greater force during the reign of his grandson. Though the period was one of constant political turmoil, the monotony of the history of the domestic administrative departments shows, more than in any previous period, how independent the administrative system was of the fluctuations of political parties and of the struggles in court and parliament. Continuity was the key-note of the wardrobe throughout the twenty-three years of Richard's reign. It is discernible alike in the permanence of the administrative staff, in the regularity of the amount and apportionment of the domestic revenue and expenditure, and in the increasing extent to which the sums appropriated to the wardrobe were devoted to the maintenance of the domestic establishment of the crown. Whichever party was in power, alike when the king was a minor or a puppet and when he was loudly proclaiming an exalted theory of prerogative, the wardrobe of the household pursued an even course, undisturbed by revolution, civil war or aristocratic pressure. Never was the wardrobe so little an office of state, a wheel of the political machine, as now.

The wardrobe staff seems to have been almost unrelated to the political revolutions of the period. So far as such a connection existed, it was limited to the lay officers of the royal household. We have seen already how important the stewards and chamberlains of the reign were in general politics. The dominant power, whether king or nobles, took care that they should be men of sound political views. Of the two offices, the chamberlainship, the

changes in which recorded with such fidelity the political mutations of the reign, was the more dignified, but it was by this time almost entirely divorced from the wardrobe. The stewardship, however, although equally susceptible to political change, remained closely connected with the household. The general tendency was to exalt lay officers over clerical officers, and for that reason the stewards now assumed more importance, even in household affairs, than their clerical colleagues. But, like the chamberlains, they were becoming rather ministers of state than administrators of the domestic establishment of the sovereign. Accordingly stewards, like chamberlains, rose and fell with the vicissitudes of the political struggle, while the clerks and underlings went on, no matter who controlled the government. It is significant that, in these contests, chamberlains and stewards were commonly equated with the chancellor, the treasurer and the keeper of the privy seal, as two of the five great ministers of the crown. They had, in fact, followed the trail blazed by the chancellors and treasurers in an earlier age, and traversed by the keeper of the privy seal in the generation preceding that with which we are now concerned. Much of their history, therefore, has fallen naturally into the general political chapter, and of the chamberlain we shall speak more fully elsewhere,¹ but what has already been said about the steward may be supplemented in the course of the present chapter.

In spite of a disposition to give to laymen offices once the undisputed preserve of clerks, the clerical minister was almost as much in evidence under Richard II. as under Edward III. Even the confidential but obscure cleric, the secret power behind the throne, had not disappeared, as is proved by the development during Richard's reign of the office of the signet under the king's secretary, who was invariably a cleric until the days of the Reformation. But such confidants are to be sought in the secretary's office, or in the clerks of the king's private chapel or confessional, and not in the wardrobe, from which they had practically disappeared. The wardrobe was ceasing to be a school for the clerical official, his starting-point for mounting up into the great offices of church and state, to bishoprics, the chancery and the treasury. Of the two different types of

¹ See below, ch. xiii.

wardrobe clerk we noted in the reign of Edward III., the more splendid and ambitious was rarely seen. There was still open a career for clerical talent, but the portal to it was no longer the wardrobe of the household. During the whole of Richard's reign not a single officer of this department attained either a ministry of state or a bishopric. The only wardrobe functionary of the time who became a bishop later was Richard Clifford, bishop of London under Henry IV. Clifford was clerk of the great wardrobe under Richard, but he was advanced, not for that service, but because of his subsequent promotion to the privy seal.

With little chance of promotion outside their office, the wardrobe clerks of Richard II. either died in wardrobe harness or retired at an advanced age to the obscurity of prebends and livings. Such men had no concern with initiation or policy. They were simply channels for the execution of orders, and remained stolidly at their posts, regardless of changes of ministry or monarchs. The result was that the average tenure of wardrobe office was very much greater than it had ever been before. For the same reason few wardrobe ministers were now brought in from the outside. The wardrobe offered a lifetime's career, and its directors were normally those who had worked their way up from the bottom of the ladder. A fresh element came in only when a new monarch gave his chief official posts to his old followers as prince.

Usually we have had to speak, at some length, of the pre-regnal administrative system of the sovereign, but Richard of Bordeaux's household had no importance until his creation as prince of Wales, just a few months before his accession to the throne. Not until January 1, 1377, did Richard, who had been made prince of Wales on November 20, 1376, receive a household worthy of his rank. It was staffed largely by the old retainers of his father. At the head was John Fordham, who was already provost of Wingham and warden of St. Cross, Winchester.¹ He was a king's clerk of some standing and had long served the Black Prince, being in 1375 his "secretary"—that is, I imagine,

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1370-74, pp. 159, 194. He was also, in 1375, prebendary of Lincoln; *ib.* 1374-77, p. 76. For his other preferments see *C. Pap. Reg. Let.* iv. 199. Fordham is omitted from the *D.N.B.*, though he certainly ought to have been there.

the keeper of his seal¹—and had recently been appointed one of his executors. He was constituted general receiver and keeper of the privy seal of the new prince of Wales, an interesting duplication of offices not without precedents in the household of a minor. We are fortunate in still possessing Fordham's accounts as receiver up to his master's accession to the throne.² They show, for less than six months, an income of £2573 : 2 : 4, derived largely from the prince's estates but partly from Wykeham's forfeited temporalities and a liberal donation from the citizens of London. Despite his separate household, Richard continued to live with his mother until he became king, so that Fordham paid a large proportion of this revenue to William Pakington, the household treasurer of the princess of Wales, "for the expenses of the lord prince and his *familia*, then dwelling with his lady mother in her household."³ But there were also sources of expenditure personal to the boy prince, such as the expenses of his officers when "out of court," including those of his *magister*, Guichard d'Angle, "sent to Paris on the prince's secret business."⁴ We also learn that the receiver bought ammunition and guns at Calais for the prince's Welsh castles, then threatened with invasion by Sir Owen of Wales.⁵ Light is thrown, moreover, on the organisation of the prince's household. There was a chamber under his chamberlain, Sir Simon Burley, another old servant of the Black Prince, with John Bacon,

¹ *C.Ch.R.* v. 241. Compare *C.P.R.*, 1331–85, p. 362, a ratification of his estates and franchises as bishop of Durham. See also the privy seal warrant in *C.W.* 1339/13: "qui nobis et genitori nostro celeberrime memorie per magna tempora deseruiit."

² *E.A.* 398/8. Its limits are fixed by the payments of Fordham's wages of 5s. a day "a primo Januarii, quo die oneratus fuit de officiis custodis priuati sigilli ac receptoris generalis domini principis, usque ad xxij^m diem Junii proximum sequentem, quo die rex Ricardus primo regnauit." All this time Fordham was "morando in Londoniis ex hac causa."

³ *Ib.* "Pro expensis dicti domini principis et familie sue cum eadem domina matre in hospicio suo tunc commorancium."

⁴ *Ib.* "Misso versus Parisius dicto mense Januarii pro certis secretis negociis domini principis."

⁵ *Ib.* Payment of 56/8 to the prince's "balistarius" "ad morandum in dictis partibus South Wallie pro maiori securitate eorundem tempore estatis, quod tunc periculosum apparebat occasione cuiusdam Wallici vocati Owain in Francia tunc existentis qui partes illas tunc invadere disponebat." This is a new manifestation of Owain Llawgoch's activities. Danger was removed by the pretender's death in Brittany; *Anon. Chron.* p. 120, which calls him "Uwain od rouge mayne."

clerk, as its receiver. William Ralphs was the prince's tailor and in charge of his great wardrobe;¹ and Richard of Abberbury was the steward of his lands. The prince also had his "balistarius," his "custos armorum," his surgeon, his council, his office of privy seal with its costly new seal of silver, his wardrobe and his receipt, and his barge, with its master and twelve bargemen, gorgeously arrayed in a uniform of red-rayed cloth of Candlewick Street. Altogether his payments and expenses amounted to £2165 : 4 : 6, and narrowly approached his receipts. But along with the prince's expenses went those of the noble youths brought up with him. Chief among these was his cousin Henry, earl of Derby; and John Arundel, the son of Sir John Arundel, marshal of England, and nephew of the earl and of bishop Thomas of Ely. While we shall be able, as usual, to stress the fidelity of the prince's servants to their master all through his life, another aspect of mediaeval conditions is revealed by the fact that the cousin and playmate of the king's youth became his chief enemy, and ultimately his supplanter.

We shall find many of the officers of the prince's short-lived household continued as important functionaries when Richard became king, and to them must be added other old servants of his father, such as William Pakington, who, up to Richard's accession, remained in the service of his mother. The household the princess Joan maintained, even though her husband's estates were in the king's hands, was by no means weakened by her son's advent to the throne. She was a vigorous and masterful lady, enterprising and energetic in spite of the excessive corpulence which was reducing her physical activity. A considerable heiress in her own right, she had early been accustomed to the control of a great establishment, and was by no means anxious to curtail her estate now that her son was king. The household of the princess of Wales after 1376 was an abbreviated continuation of the household of the Black Prince. Some of her husband's more devoted followers Joan kept in her own service until her death, nearly ten years later. But the most trusted of the Black Prince's dependents, with the princess's receiver, William Pakington, at their head, supplied the new

¹ His accounts are in L.T.R. *Foreign Accounts*, 14/18 (really m. 1). See for them later, pp. 384-385, and 388.

element which the accession of the boy king brought into the royal household. There was not as much change in personnel as when Edward II. brought in his own followers to reverse his father's policy, nor even as much as when Edward III. blended with his father's less faithful servants representatives of his own and his mother's households. As before, the new wardrobe staff comprised the holders of office at the time of the monarch's decease, strengthened by the personal servants of the heir.

The first few weeks of the new reign witnessed a curious but temporary indecision. Normally the old household officers went out of place or received reappointment from their new master. But the substitution of a boy for a dotard, when the fierce feuds of contending factions were still unsettled, was not likely to involve far-reaching changes. We have seen already how little the great offices of state were affected. The wardrobe was, for the moment, equally undisturbed. The existing officers—Richard Beverley, the keeper; William Street, the controller; and John Carp, the cofferer—continued to act for more than a month. Even more dilatoriness was, as we shall see later, shown concerning the chamber and the great and privy wardrobes. However, on July 1 changes were made. The boy king was supposed to have appointed “by word of mouth” successors to his grandfather's wardrobe officers. Of the clerks, only Carp was confirmed in his former office, while Beverley¹ and Street were succeeded by William Pakington and Reginald Hilton. Of the laymen, Sir John of Ypres relinquished the stewardship to go back to the whole-hearted service of his ancient master, being for the rest of his life the chief of John of Gaunt's council. The new officers began their account formally on July 1,² though it overlapped with the old account which only terminated on July 26. It was not until August 4 that the officers of the wardrobe and great

¹ It is possible that Beverley went, like Ypres, to John of Gaunt's service, for there was a Richard Beverley, treasurer of the duke's household up to Oct. 1, 1380, when he surrendered his office to John Norfolk; *Duchy of Lanc. Misc.* xiv. f. 39. He may of course have been another person of the same name. A Richard Beverley received a protection for the French campaign of 1372; *John of Gaunt's Register*, i. 33. There was also a knight, Sir Richard Beverley, who was earlier in Lancaster's service and who gave evidence in favour of Richard Scrope in his suit against Robert Grosvenor; *Scrope and Grosvenor Roll*, i. p. 54. These difficulties of various persons of the same name are largely insoluble.

² *E.A.* 400/3. “Primo die Julii, quo die dictum officium commissum fuit eidem Willelmo per ipsum regem oretenus.”

wardrobe of the old king were ordered to surrender to Pakington the valuables in their custody.¹

The result was that the old household of "our grandfather," coexisted for a time with the new household of Richard II. and was made responsible for the costly funeral of its former master. There was the less need for the new king's wardrobe to be completed hastily; since John of Gaunt, as steward of England, took upon himself the duty of supervising the arrangements for his nephew's coronation. The most conspicuous illustration of the slowness of the process by which the household of Richard II. was evolved is furnished by the office of the great wardrobe. The "keeper of the great wardrobe of our grandfather" remained in office, and in possession of its effects, for a year after Richard's accession, though the responsibility for both was so firmly imposed upon Walter Ralphs that he was finally called upon to account for part of this period, as if he had been the *de facto* keeper.² Carp represents adequately the household service of Edward III. He remained uninterruptedly in office until his death, before he had tendered his last account, soon after the revolution of 1399. Since 1368, at least, he had been a wardrobe clerk, and had probably succeeded Beverley as cofferer in 1376. He continued cofferer from 1377 to July 1390, when, like Beverley, he was promoted directly to the keepership, which he retained until the deposition of Richard II. Carp enjoyed, then, an unbroken wardrobe career of over thirty years. We have no information as to his character, personality or individual action; but his very lack of positive qualities makes him the typical wardrobe clerk of the new reign. He was also the only wardrobe clerk of Edward III. who survived for any length of time the death of his master.

¹ *Foedera*, iv. 15. This entry is badly mistranslated in *C.C.R.*, 1377-81, p. 23. It shows that on Aug. 4 the jewels and plate needed for the young king's chapel and household were still in the charge of Edward III.'s officials. They were called upon to surrender them "quousque de administratione bonorum quae fuerunt predicti avi nostri legitime fuerit ordinatum." The writ quaintly describes Beverley and Pakington as "successive custos magne garderobe," another instance of official confusion between the two wardrobes. To his first account Pakington appends a list of the valuables he had received "de executoribus Willelmi de Mulsho, nuper custodis garderobe hospicii," as well as from Sleaford and John Bacon; *E.A.* 400/3. Moulsoe's account was clearly neither audited nor passed, and Beverley seems to have been an interim keeper between two regular officials rather than an officer in his own right.

² See later, pp. 384-385.

The new element brought into the household of the king—that of the servants of the Black Prince—is best represented by Beverley's successor as keeper, William Pakington. A clerk with Leicester connections, Pakington had been in the Black Prince's service since 1364, when he received protection as about to join the prince's following in Aquitaine. He may have served prince Edward even earlier, and already held the Leicestershire living of Burton Overy, perhaps by his lord's presentation.¹ After the Black Prince's death, Pakington became general receiver of his widow until he was transferred to the service of their son. Richard retained him as keeper until his death on July 25, 1390,² so that his executors had to tender his last account to the exchequer on his behalf. It is difficult to form any idea of Pakington's personality or mentality from the bald details which the sources alone give us. The most interesting thing about him is that he has been claimed as one of the little band of literary officials on the strength of a chronicle, attributed to him by sixteenth-century writers.³ The original is lost; an epitome which he is said

¹ *Foedera*, iii. 731. Protection of April 13, 1364, for one year, to "Willelmus de Pakyngton, persona ecclesiae de Burton Novery, in comitatu primogeniti regis moraturus. Per testimonium ipsius principis." Bateson's *Records of Leicester*, ii. *passim*, mention various persons named Pakington as burgesses of that borough. There was a John de Pakyngton (or Palyngton) whom the Black Prince described as "dilectus famulus noster" when granting him and Beatrice his wife lands at Berkhamsted; *Exch. T.R. Books*, 278/66. Was he a brother of William? The name is doubtless taken from the Packington on the Leicestershire border, near Ashby de la Zouch. William Pakington resigned Burton Overy before 1372, when he became keeper of the alien priory of Ware; *C.P.R.*, 1370-74, p. 164.

² "Quo die predictus Willelmus obiit"; *E.A.* 402/4.

³ The source of this statement seems to be Leland's *Collectanea*, i. 455, where he is said to have written a chronicle in French "from 9 John until his own time," dedicated to the Black Prince. From an epitome of this in French, Leland translated a number of passages; *ib.* pp. 455-470. Dr. F. W. D. Brie, who edited the English *Brute Chronicle* for the Early English Text Society (2 vols., 1906 and 1908), claimed in 1904 that he had discovered the epitome mentioned by Leland in *MS. Cotton, Tib. A. vi. ff. 121-199*; *Notes and Queries*, tenth series, ii. 41, "Recovery of an Anglo-Norman Chronicle" (1904). Compare his *Geschichte und Quellen der mittelenenglischen Prosachronik*, "*The Brute of England*" (Marburg, 1905), especially pp. 47-51; "William Packington und seine Bedeutung." This purports to be a summary of an elaborate introduction to his edition of the *Brute Chronicle* which has never seen the light. It is difficult to believe that Dr. Brie has proved his point or that Leland's attribution rests on firm grounds. I have examined *MS. Cotton, Tib. A. vi.*, but find nothing in it that associates Pakington with the work; and the similarities quoted by Dr. Brie, though interesting, are not very convincing. Moreover, it begins not with "9 John" but with Hardicanute's death in 1042. Between 1333 and

to have made of it has been identified with a surviving manuscript. But the evidence is doubtful and does not become more convincing on examination. We are on safer ground in recording his grants and preferments. Among the former was a house in London, forfeited by John Northampton in 1385.¹ Among the latter were the deanery of the king's free chapel of Stafford,² the important archdeaconry of Canterbury,³ and finally the deanery of St. Martin's le Grand, still a special preserve of wardrobe clerks.⁴ His most interesting preferment was to the chancellorship of the exchequer in 1381,⁵ to which post he was appointed for life.⁶ That important exchequer and household charges could be held concurrently was a curious illustration of the breaking down of the old line between household appointments and those to more strictly state departments.

The establishments of the king and prince of Wales had, under Edward III., become so separate that it is almost useless to seek, in the chancery rolls of the king, information as to the doings of the ministers of the prince. We can elicit from the chancery rolls few references to such an important officer of the former prince of Wales as Pakington. They give no information at all about the earlier history of Reginald Hilton, a priest from the diocese of Lichfield, who became Pakington's controller. It may be permissible to infer that he too had been a clerk of the household of the Black Prince and the princess Joan, for it is

1346, when it ends, it becomes very fragmentary. As Pakington's official career runs from the early 'sixties to 1390, it can hardly be described as contemporary work, especially as it is meagre and uninforming when approaching his own time. The connection of Pakington with chronicle-making must therefore remain doubtful in the present state of our knowledge. See also Tait's *Chronica Johannis de Reading*, etc. (1914), especially introduction, pp. 48, 78.

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, pp. 18, 116. It is doubtful whether this grant throws any light on Pakington's own political affinities. The relations of civic with national politics are obscure. See Miss R. Burd's M.A. thesis, "Civic Factions in London and their Relation to Political Parties, 1376-99," summarised in *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, i. 33-34.

² *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 556.

³ *Ib.* 1381-85, p. 39.

⁴ *Ib.*, 1388-92, p. 183. This was on Jan. 20, 1390, by the king. The appointment was renewed on April 11 in succession to Richard Medford, for whom see above, iii. 429, 434, 457.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 588. This was on Jan. 6.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 599. "In the same manner as Master William de Charlton, his predecessor." This looks as if a life tenure of the office was likely to become permanent by reason of the two precedents. His successor, John Nottingham, appointed on July 26, 1390, the day after Pakington's death, was, however, to hold office during good behaviour; *ib.*, 1388-92, p. 295.

difficult to believe that chancery would not have made some record of the preferment of even the humblest of king's clerks. After his appointment as controller, Hilton figures in the rolls mainly as the recipient of preferment such as was usually bestowed upon king's clerks. He was given, among others, the rich rectory of Meifod in the diocese of St. Asaph, which he had to defend against a rival "provided" by the pope. This involved him in litigation at the curia. It dragged on for years without result,¹ and indirectly lost him his office in the household. He ceased to be controller on September 30, 1381,² and on November 12, a prohibition was issued, forbidding him to leave the realm without the king's permission, as the king had learnt that it was his intention to depart secretly by colour of a citation to answer abroad on matters which ought to be determined in the king's court.³ However, Hilton survived the trouble, and was exchanging benefices as late as 1389,⁴ and giving advice to the crown in 1390,⁵ but after that we know no more of his doings.

Hilton's successor as controller was Baldwin Raddington, who remained in that office for the unprecedented period of sixteen years, between September 30, 1381, and September 30, 1397.⁶ Hilton had broken the continuity of lay controllers like Ypres and Street, but Raddington and his successor renewed lay control for the rest of Richard's reign. He was a West Somerset landowner who derived his name from the village of Raddington, near Wiveliscombe, a manor held by his family since the thirteenth century.⁷ The absolute silence of the chancery rolls about him before Richard's reign, confirms what we can prove from other sources, namely that he had, in early life, been a follower of the Black Prince. After the coronation he was brought into Richard's household,⁸ much in the same way as Pakington. We know that

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 602. The suit between Hilton and John Trefnant was still undetermined in 1391, when Boniface IX. appointed a third party to Meifod; *C. Pap. Reg. Let.* iv. 427.

² *E.A.* 400/11.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1381-85, p. 22.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1388-92, pp. 157, 163.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 233.

⁶ *E.A.* 400/19, 403/9, 10.

⁷ *Feudal Aids*, iv. 275. The family was also patron of the living; *Reg. Rad. de Salopia*, p. 279, Som. Rec. Soc. In 1377 Baldwin and his wife had license to enclose their demesne lands within the forests of Petherton and Exmoor, to prevent deer wasting them; *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 57.

⁸ *C.C.R.*, 1385-89, pp. 35-36.

he was an esquire of the household from Richard's accession,¹ and that he became receiver of the king's chamber and keeper of certain jewels there, under the direction of Simon Burley, the under-chamberlain. For a time, he combined offices in chamber and wardrobe, but he was acquitted of his chamber account on July 23, 1382.² He was knight of the shire for Middlesex in the Northampton parliament of 1380,³ and was justice of oyer and terminer in that shire along with prominent Londoners like Philpot and Brember.⁴ He was as much associated with London and its neighbourhood as with Somerset. Raddington was the wardrobe officer whose name appears most often in the chronicles of the time as taking a clearly defined part in war and politics. Knighted by 1386, he received in October 1387 a grant of 50 marks a year from the Cheshire exchequer in recognition of his good service to the king and his father, to help support the "worshipful estate" of knighthood to which he had been advanced, and because "he has had heretofore but moderate remuneration for his services."⁵ Despite his close association with Burley, the London capitalists and the court party, he managed to continue in office during the whole period of aristocratic control between 1386 and 1389. Yet he did not conceal his curialistic sympathies, as witness his chivalrous support of the impeached Burley in 1388,⁶ and it was not until the king took power into his own

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 57.

² *Ib.*, 1381-85, p. 157. For Raddington's previous chamber work, see later, pp. 333-334.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1377-81, p. 497; Prynn, *Parl. Writs*, iv. 346. He received a writ for expenses on Dec. 6, for 37 days' attendance.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, p. 71.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1385-89, p. 356.

⁶ See above, iii. 434-435. Although Raddington was, perhaps, a kinsman of Burley, who certainly had started him on his career, there is no direct evidence on the point. The nearest approach is the statement of Favent, p. 21, that Sir John Raddington, who succeeded Hales in 1381 as English prior of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, was "uncle to Burley." As Burley was an elderly man, it is not likely, though not impossible, that this was the literal truth, but it may indicate some ill-defined degree of kinship. John, like Baldwin, joined in the vain plea for mercy for Burley. There is no proved kinship between the two Raddingtons, but probably they were related. If these guesses are right, Raddington's devotion to Burley is easily explained. Another problem also arises. Was Baldwin Raddington the "dominus Baldewynus miles" who, on Nov. 22, 1389, married the widow of Sir Nicholas Brember; Monk West., p. 218? This lady was Idonea, a daughter of John Stody, a prominent London vintner, sometime mayor and alderman, and king's butler after Sept. 30, 1359; *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 272. When Stody died in 1375 he divided his fortune between his four daughters (*Cal. Wills proved in Court of Hustings*, ii. 191-192), so

hands that Raddington once more had free scope for his activity.

Already in 1386 Raddington had begun that development of the military side of the household which gives to his controllership a special place in administrative history. The soldiers of the household were now more than enough to safeguard the king, so that, when French invasion was threatened, the surplus was told off to take its share in the defence of the realm. Then for the first time the command of the household troops was entrusted to the knightly controller instead of to the steward, and in the summer of 1386 the "superfluous household" was sent under Raddington to Sandwich to garrison that port and protect the neighbouring coast from French invasion.¹ One result of their activity was the capture of two well laden French ships.² The restoration of these ships to their owners, by the chancellor, may be a sign of friction between the controller and the king's favourite minister, which would account for Raddington remaining in office after the fall of Pole.³

Raddington touched the high-water mark of his career in 1392, when he was, on July 22, made keeper of London.⁴ He retained that post until, largely through his efforts, self-government was restored to the city. In 1394 he was sent to Ireland with Sir John Stanley, the former governor, to prepare for the king's arrival.⁵ On September 30, 1397, he was succeeded as controller by Stanley, and then seems to have retired from active life, on a pension. We know that this pension fell into arrears, for he survived long enough to receive from Henry IV. an order for their payment and a continuance of the grant for the rest of his life. Though condemned for his military rigidity, the tact and temper

that Idonea was quite well-to-do. But if Raddington married Brember's widow, the appellants were singularly lenient in allowing him to remain at court. We must never, however, overstress the durability of mediaeval ties, whether of party or of affinity.

¹ Monk West., p. 83: "Ordinatum est . . . ut per totam aestatem quidam de familia regis, scilicet superabundantes in suo hospicio, transirent Sandwycum et custodirent loca maritima ibidem ab inimicorum invasione." This custody began early in the summer, for the wardrobe account contains, under May 26, the entry: "Domino Baldewyno de Radyngton, militi, contrarotulatori hospicii regis, commoranti in villa de Sandewyc cum quibusdam certis personis de familia dicti hospicii super salua custodia dicte ville"; *E.A.* 403/23.

³ *Ib.* 211.

² *Cont. Knighton*, ii. 206.

⁴ See above, iii. 481.

⁵ *E.A.* 402/20, p. 61. They received wages for 6 men at arms and 40 horse archers, from Sept. 7, 1394, to April 21, 1395. See also above, iii. 488-489.

shown by Raddington, in bringing together the king and the Londoners, suggests a competent official worthy of the praise he received even from the St. Albans historians.¹

Raddington's successor as controller, Sir John Stanley, held office from October 1, 1397, to the end of the reign on September 30, 1399. Stanley was the younger son of a branch of a Staffordshire family which had recently established itself in the Wirral peninsula. He was, therefore, one of the Cheshire men whom Richard II. especially delighted to honour.² Originally perhaps attached to the household of Henry of Derby, Stanley served the king in Ireland, the Scottish march and in his own Cheshire, where he was justice in 1394. He was, as we have noticed, closely associated with Raddington in Ireland in the expedition of 1394-95. His familiarity with household business as esquire and knight made him a natural successor to Raddington as controller, and the lay tradition of the office was permanently assured by this succession of one knight to another. The systematic development of the military side of the household, the enrolment of the king's yeomen of the white hart, and the strengthening of the body-guard of fierce Cheshire men who protected Richard from his subjects, was continued by him to an extent far beyond that aimed at in the days of Raddington. This made Stanley so useful to the crown that he was able to make that office the starting point of a great career for himself and his family. He was the first lay controller to have such an opportunity. By his marriage with the heiress of Lathom and Knowsley, he first procured a footing for the Stanleys in Lancashire. His claims on Lathom brought him into conflict with John of Gaunt, and may have predisposed him, for the moment, to an anti-Lancastrian policy.³ But when his old lord, Henry of Derby, had established himself, it was easy for Stanley to resume his first allegiance. His kinsman, Thomas Stanley, the prominent clerk of chancery who

¹ Monk West., p. 274: Walsingham, ii. 209, describes him as "virum discretum et providum qui sciret delinire moerorem civium et eorum mentes erigere ad spem bonam."

² The best summary of Stanley's early history is in Wylie's *History of England under Henry IV.* ii. 289-290, with full references to the original sources.

³ *Rot. Parl.* iii. 204-205. Lancaster complained of Stanley's claims to the parliament of 1385, and obtained a verdict "quod ingressus quem idem Johannes [de Stanley] fecit in manerium predictum [de Lathom] illicitus fuit et manifeste contra libertatem ipsius regis [Castelle] et ducis supradictam."

from 1397 was keeper of the rolls,¹ followed much the same course. Both promptly deserted Richard in 1399, and both contributed to secure the permanent greatness of a house that, within less than a century, received the earldom of Derby, hitherto associated with the house of Lancaster, still held by his descendants. The controllership of the household, leading up to now, at best, to a personal career for an ambitious clerk, was in future generally accessible to laymen. If Stanley's successors did not discharge in the wardrobe meticulous personal duties, like the controllers of our period, their comparative freedom from routine, combined with their close association with the sovereign, gave them a political status every whit as great as that of their clerical predecessors.

The cofferership retained more of its original character, but shared with the other wardrobe offices in greater stability of tenure. We have already seen that it was the starting point of the careers of Beverley and Carp. Carp held the cofferership for nearly fourteen years before he was in 1390 promoted to the keepership. His successor, John Stacy, had been a king's clerk since the early years of Richard's reign,² and received, after 1385, a liberal allowance of livings and prebends. It is likely that he immediately followed Carp as cofferer and that he retained the post until his death in 1395.³ He certainly attended the king on his first Irish expedition of 1394-95, when, like greater personages, he was allowed wages of war for himself and his little *comitua* of two esquires and six horse archers.⁴ He was replaced by Thomas More, king's clerk, who remained cofferer until the end of the reign.⁵

Since the king's marriage in 1382, Thomas More, a king's clerk, had been attached to the household of queen Anne of Bohemia, soon becoming her general receiver. Already acting

¹ See for him above, p. 51.

² *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, pp. 384, 448.

³ Stacy was certainly alive in the spring of 1395, but was dead before Sept. 30 of that year. In 1395-96 his executors paid £40 into the wardrobe for moneys received by him on May 6, 1394; *E.A.* 403/9. In *ib.* 402/15 he is spoken of on Mar. 3, 1398, as "jadis cofferer qui mort est."

⁴ *Ib.* 402/20.

⁵ We know More acted from Oct. 1, 1395, to Sept. 30, 1396, when he was "extra curiam" for 73 days; *E.A.* 403/10, m. 39d. He was still in office on Jan. 3 (*Ib.* 403/17) and Jan. 30, 1398; *Devon*, p. 266. It seems clear that he served between Stacy's death and the king's fall.

as such in 1386, he continued until the queen's death in June 1394.¹ His name figures in the contemporary wardrobe accounts, since Anne, like Philippa of Hainault, was in the habit of paying into the wardrobe sums from her own revenues towards the support of the king's household. The first of such entries is for 1386-87, when the "foreign receipt" included £733 : 6 : 8 paid by More as queen's receiver in aid of the expenses of the household of the king.² The following year the amount was only £205,³ and in the next no more than £347 : 13 : 4.⁴ However, by 1392-93 it had risen to £1200.⁵ The year after, it dropped again, to £809 : 10 : 11½, but the period ended on September 30 and Anne had died on June 7.⁶ A similar burden of debt weighed upon Anne as upon Philippa, and to wind up her estate, More was at once appointed receiver-general of all sums due to the late queen, with authority to levy the same and sell her stores.⁷ It was not until eighteen months later that the end of this troublesome job was foreshadowed by the appointment of auditors for More's account.⁸ There had, however, to be another appointment of auditors on October 20, 1397,⁹ so that final settlement was not easily secured.

Long before this, More had been transferred to the king's wardrobe to succeed Stacy as cofferer. Along with other wardrobe officers, More accompanied Richard to Ireland in the fatal second expedition of 1399.¹⁰ He shared the easy disposition of his colleagues to accept accomplished facts, and by 1401 had become keeper of the wardrobe of Henry IV., the third cofferer of Richard II. to be elevated to the keepership. Gradually the keepership began to lose more of its characteristics. Within five years, the post was held by a layman, Sir John Tiptoft, whose tenure from 1406 to 1408 broke, for the keepership, the clerical

¹ In 1382 More was already acting on commissions to look after the queen's interests; *C.P.R.*, 1382-85, pp. 197, 592. He was serving as treasurer or general receiver in 1386, Richard Abberbury, the well-known knight of Richard's chamber, being her chamberlain; *ib.*, 1385-89, p. 154.

² *E.A.* 401/19: "ad expensas hospicii domini regis." These were paid between Oct. 1, 1386, and July 27, 1387.

³ *Ib.* 401/20.

⁴ *Ib.* 402/3.

⁵ *Ib.* 402/10, f. 4.

⁶ This was Whitsunday. The last payment by More was on June 8; *ib.* 402/20, m. 2.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1388-91, p. 419.

⁸ *Ib.* p. 689. This was on Feb. 15, 1396.

⁹ *Ib.*, 1396-99, p. 245.

¹⁰ *Ib.*, 1396-99, p. 522. This is dated April 15.

tradition destroyed earlier for the controllership.¹ Just as Stanley began in the latter office, so Tiptoft, from the former, made the first step in an even more rapid advance to fortune. Already a famous Speaker of the commons, Tiptoft later became a baron, and his sinister, but able, son was raised to the earldom of Worcester. Thus, soon after the end of our period, the old *camera clericorum* of the days of Edward I. was handed over to lay direction, having previously lost most of its political importance. When the Tudors revived household administration of state affairs, they adopted not the wardrobe, but the chamber and the secretariat, as the instruments of their policy. The old tradition of giving special power to the personal entourage of the sovereign still lingered on, and put stewards and chamberlains, almost as a matter of course, into the severely restricted cabinets of the eighteenth century. It survives to this day, curiously enough, in the chamberlain's censorship of plays produced within the verge of the London court, and in certain ministerial posts still bearing the names of the wardrobe and household offices of the later middle ages.

Stability and insignificance are not only characteristic of the chief officers of Richard's wardrobe of the household. Between 1377 and 1399 there were no more than three keepers of the great wardrobe.² Though the death of three keepers in succession necessitated as many changes in the headship of the privy wardrobe between 1377 and 1382, there were only two keepers of the privy wardrobe between 1382 and 1399.³ The same continuity was permitted in the inferior household appointments. For instance, William Corby was clerk of the market and coroner of the household from 1387 to 1399; John Slegh, or Sly, chief butler from 1382 to his death in 1396; and William Snell, king's armourer from 1377 to 1395. In the executive, as in the mechanical branches of the household, the rule of permanence, broken only by death or rare promotion, seems to have been normal.

¹ The first two keepers of Henry IV. were clerks, Thomas Tutbury and Richard Kingston. Tutbury had been treasurer of John of Gaunt, and Kingston was Henry's treasurer for war during his crusade to Barbary, Prussia and the Holy Land in 1390-93; L. T. Smith's *Expeditions of Henry of Derby, 1390-91 and 1392-93* (Camden Soc.). Thus Henry IV. fully kept up the tradition of bringing his personal followers into the household, despite the readiness of Richard's old servants to act under him. Henry's first controller was a clerk.

² See later, pp. 384-386.

³ See later, pp. 464-465.

The impression, derived from the household accounts, as to continuity of service is seldom disturbed by the chroniclers, on the rare occasions on which such questions command their notice. There are one or two exceptions, however. For example, when, on December 31, 1387, the lords appellant established their authority over the king, they made, according to the monk of Westminster, a clean sweep of the household departments. They looked into the numbers of subordinates employed in the various offices of the household. They found a hundred servants in the office of the buttry and a similar superfluity of numbers in the kitchen. Many officers were accordingly removed, though quite enough persons were left to do the work.¹ Clearly, this was not punishment for erroneous politics, but only an economical dismissal of unnecessary crown servants. We have, unfortunately, no detailed household account for this particular year, but it may fairly be doubted whether the chronicler was speaking according to knowledge. He is certainly wrong in saying that all the *familiares*, especially near the king, were removed and others put in their place.²

We have already noticed the strong political bias of the stewards of the household in the reign of Richard II.³ Each of the six who served him represented a political faction, and went in and out of office for a definite reason of state. Richard Scrope of Bolton, who was of the party of John of Gaunt, acted up to October 29, 1378, when he was promoted to the chancery. His successor, Sir Hugh Segrave, was one of the old officers of the Black Prince and was similarly raised, on August 10, 1381, to the treasurership of the exchequer. The next steward, Sir John Montague, was brother of the second earl of Salisbury of his house, and father of the third. Already an elderly man, Montague had served in the French wars from Crécy onwards, and had sat in parliament since 1357. He nevertheless threw in his lot with the courtiers, and showed his zeal for the young king's interests in condemning to death John Northampton, mayor of London,

¹ Monk West., p. 115: "Et de multitudine officiariorum in unoquoque officio existencium sunt scrutati, et inventi sunt in officio bottelariae c. officarii. Sicque in officio coquinae ac in omnibus aliis officiis superfluos invenerunt; unde defalcata illorum numerositate satis competentes adhuc in dictis officiis reliquerunt."

² *Ib.* p. 116. Compare above, iii. 429-430.

³ Above, pp. 187-188.

when the chief justice refused to exercise jurisdiction over him.¹ In January 1387 the king removed Montague from the stewardship, putting John Beauchamp of Holt in his stead.² Montague's increasing years account for this step, for he made his will in 1388 and died in 1389, leaving a son who vigorously continued his courtier policy.³

John Beauchamp of Holt was a king's esquire from the beginning of the reign, and by 1386 he had become receiver of the chamber. He was knighted in that same year, and was one of those chamber knights whom Richard specially trusted. One of his duties as esquire, knight and receiver had been to look after certain of the king's jewels.⁴ As steward, he upheld the curialist policy to its fullest extent, and for reward was, on October 10, 1387, created by patent "peer and baron of the realm of England under the style of lord of Beauchamp and baron of Kidderminster," in "consideration of his good and gratuitous services, his noble and trusty family and his great sense and circumspection." Special emphasis was laid upon both the titular and the hereditary nature of this barony, granted to Beauchamp and the heirs male of his body.⁵ This grant is memorable as being the first barony created by patent, and the whole language of the writ expresses a conception of barony and peerage impossible under Edward II. and a novelty under Edward III. The new baron did not long enjoy his rank. Although not appealed of treason by the lords appellant, he was impeached by the commons in the Merciless Parliament. Condemned as a traitor on May 12, 1388, he was relieved, as a magnate and as steward, from the worst horrors of a traitor's death, but was taken straightway from Westminster to the Tower and beheaded on the same day.⁶

¹ Malvern, p. 48.

² *Ib.* p. 90.

³ See for the younger Montague above, iii. 425, n. 1.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 179. He was relieved of his charge of jewels, and acquitted of his accounts, on Feb. 5, 1387. He therefore resigned his keepership of jewels when promoted to the stewardship.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 363. The patent is quoted in full in Courthope's "Observations on Dignities," in *Historic Peerage of England*, pp. xlii-xliii (1857). Noteworthy are the words, "Volentes quod idem Johannes et heredes masculi de corpore suo exeuntes statum baronis obtineant ac domini de Beauchamp et barones de Kidderminster nuncupantur." This is the first instance of the legal use of "baron" as a term of individual dignity; Pike, *Constitutional History of the House of Lords*, p. 100.

⁶ Monk West., pp. 156, 178. See above, iii. 434-435.

One of the most intimate allies of the appellants was put by the barons into Beauchamp's post. Already on April 18, 1388, Sir John Devereux was acting as steward.¹ A Herefordshire gentleman, who had been a lifelong follower of the Black Prince, Devereux was a member of the first standing council of Richard's minority, a king's knight, and from 1380 captain of Calais.² He gradually drifted into the opposition ranks, excited the king's indignation by his partisanship of archbishop Courtenay in 1385,³ and was active in the service of the commons of the Merciless Parliament.⁴ It was humiliating to the king that Devereux should be imposed upon him, as steward, and also as the successor to Burley in the constablenesship of Dover. Devereux remained steward until his sudden death on February 22, 1393.⁵

The successor to Devereux, Sir Thomas Percy, had already made his mark as a soldier and politician, and had been vice-chamberlain since 1390. His later career belongs to general history, but he retained his position at court until the king's deposition, notwithstanding his elevation to the treasury and to the earldom of Worcester, which were his rewards for the energy he exhibited against archbishop Arundel and his brother.⁶ Returning home from Ireland with Richard in 1399, Percy regretfully announced to the household the flight of the king, broke his wand of office, bade the household seek its own salvation,⁷ and at once threw in his fortunes with Henry of Lancaster.

We must now turn from the staff of Richard II.'s wardrobe to its finances. A study of the wardrobe accounts of the reign leaves us with the same impression of regularity and limitation which characterised its personnel. There is nothing in the whole reign corresponding to the extraordinary ups and downs of the wardrobe liabilities and receipts of the reign of Edward III. In spite of the extravagant statements of the chroniclers, the wardrobe budgets throughout the reign were on a comparatively small scale, and the chief expenditure was, with few exceptions, devoted to the maintenance of the royal *hospicium*. For all the twenty-

¹ *Ib.* p. 173.

² *Foedera*, iv. 75. (Jan. 17, 1380).

³ Walsingham, ii. 128: "Taceo verba procacia et contumeliosa habita per eum (*i.e.* regem) . . . contra dominum Johannem Devorous, qui verba pro archiepiscopo facere sunt conati."

⁴ *Ib.* ii. 173.

⁵ *Ib.* ii. 213.

⁶ See above, pp. 27-28.

⁷ *Ann. Ric.* pp. 248-249.

three years of Richard's reign the average wardrobe receipt was roughly £25,250 a year, and the expenses normally were somewhat less, so that a much better equilibrium between payments and income was obtained now than in the reign of Edward III. A more meticulous examination of the individual years shows certain tendencies at work. To begin with, we can divide the wardrobe history of the reign into two periods, the line of demarcation being somewhere about 1389, when the king shook off the yoke of the lords appellant. For the first twelve years the wardrobe annual turnover was more modest than that for the last ten. From 1377 to 1389 the annual average was slightly over £18,000; from 1389 to 1399 it approached £33,900. The transition from the one period to the other was so gradual that it is not easy to determine the exact position of the line of division. In beginning the second period with October 1, 1389, we have included in it three years whose revenue and expenses were similar to those of the first period. As, however, the figures for 1389-90 show a marked increase on those of the year 1388-89, it is perhaps safest to draw the line at this point. From that date the general tendency was upward.

The high average of the last ten years was due in no small measure to the excessive expenditure of three years when the king was engaged with his household in military expeditions, notably his two journeys to Ireland in 1394-95 and in 1399. Wages of war, and other similar expenses for these years, remind us that the low averages of wardrobe obligations for Richard II.'s reign were mainly the result of the comparative peace it enjoyed, and, in particular, of the rarity of operations in which king and household took personal part. When the king was in the field and his household afforded by soldiers and sailors, the Edwardian conditions were once more renewed. Indeed a new source of permanent expense was introduced by Richard's later policy of developing the wardrobe on its military side. To the little band of household troops of former reigns he gradually added a large body-guard of Cheshire archers, and organised a system by which retainers, wearing his livery of the white hart and receiving his wages, were liable to be called up, upon occasion of civil as well as of international war.¹ In that way the distinction between

¹ See above, iii. 488-489.

the wardrobe in war and the wardrobe in peace was continued, and the permanent charge of these soldiers fell upon the wardrobe as part of its normal expense. Detailed study of wardrobe figures¹ enables us to realise more vividly that the general movement of the reign, and the fluctuations in the two periods into which we have divided its wardrobe history, were conditioned by political and military vicissitudes.

We may almost eliminate military charges from the wardrobe figures of the years 1377–89. A good deal of desultory fighting still went on, but only on one occasion did the king take any part in it, and it therefore left little mark upon the wardrobe. The financial burden of such fighting was heavy enough, but its charge had passed from the household to parliament, and special treasurers of war, chosen in parliament, were now responsible for what had formerly been the obligations of the wardrobe officers. The single campaign in which Richard, with his household, participated was that against the Scots in August 1385. It was brief in duration and contemptible from a military point of view, but it left its mark on the wardrobe totals of 1384–85, and even on those of 1385–86, the only two years of the period where the annual turnover exceeded £20,000. Apart from this disturbing element, the slightly upward tendency in expenditure during the years between 1377 and 1386 can be ascribed to the increasing age of the king, and the greater expenses of the court of an adolescent monarch, whose liberality was at all stages excessive.

An examination of the *hospicium* expenses bears out this conclusion. We may disregard their size, £13,367, in the first year of the reign, for they were swelled naturally by the cost of the sumptuous coronation, full particulars of which have been preserved.² Between 1378 and 1386 these expenses fluctuated between eleven and fifteen thousand pounds, the highest figure being that of 1381–82, namely £15,599, and the lowest that of 1382–83, namely £11,033, with an average of slightly less than £12,000. Then the opposition began to enforce its will, and imposed a compulsory economy resulting in a fall in the *hospicium* average expense for the next two years to just under £10,000.

¹ See below, Appendix to vol. v.

² These have been printed by the Roxburghe Club in 1870, *Liber Regalis seu Ordo Consecrandi Regem*. This book supplies the precedents on which the later coronation ceremonies have been conducted.

This was only slightly exceeded for the two years 1388-89 and 1389-90, while the king was slowly making himself master of his own household.

Between 1390 and 1395 the domestic expenses of the court were singularly equal from year to year, none of the years varying by more than a few hundred pounds from an average approaching £15,500. Between 1395 and 1399 the annual average rose to nearly £27,400, and the yearly fluctuations were more considerable. The only military enterprise within these limits was the second Irish expedition of 1399, but the expenses of the last year, £26,762, were lower than those of the two preceding years, which for 1396-97 were £32,331, and for 1397-98, £29,834. We may attribute the heavier cost of the royal establishment in the last years of the reign to the increased opportunities which the king's autocratic policy allowed for indulgence in generous personal expenditure, and for the development of the military side of the household.

The same result would be obtained by a similar comparison of the whole of the wardrobe expenditure for the same years. By limiting ourselves to the expenses of the *hospicium*, we get a clearer idea of the financial results of the variation in strength of the royal authority during the reign, though it would be rash to suppose that these figures covered all the king's personal expenses. There was, for instance, in spite of the small war charges, a distinct increase in the demands of Richard II. on the great wardrobe, as compared with those of his more martial grandfather.¹ Yet, whatever excesses Richard II. may have committed, the financial records of his reign suggest that he was not guilty, any more than was Edward II., of the profligate extravagance attributed to him by the chroniclers.

The significance of the *expensa hospicii* is the more pertinent since, with two exceptions, it was out and away the chief reason for wardrobe disbursements. The more important of these exceptions is furnished by the two years of September 1393 to September 1395, in which the first Irish expedition fell, between October 1394 and May 1395. This expedition was, as we have seen already, conducted, in the old-fashioned way, on household lines. The host was the household in arms, largely directed by

¹ See later, ch. xiv.

the household officers, and financed by the wardrobe clerks. Yet we notice that the *hospicium* expenses were little affected. Perhaps the cost of travel and the augmented numbers of a mobilised household in arms were neutralised by the greater simplicity of military conditions. But for the two years we find a non-*hospicium* expense of £36,277, of which not less than £28,718 were *vadia guerre*, a sum little short of the *hospicium* expense of £30,418 for the same period. There was, besides, an exceptionally large item of *prestita*, amounting to £12,677. Whenever the non-household expense mounted up, there were always correspondingly large prests. In consequence, the average receipt and expenses of the two years exceeded £40,000 a year, and we may feel sure that the eight months of the campaign were responsible for the inflation. From all points of view the burden on the wardrobe was far more onerous than it was in 1398-99, when the second Irish expedition, which was of shorter duration and of inferior military interest, took place. For this latter period the "foreign" expenses were large, but they were not much more than £13,338, and barely half the *hospicium* expenses of the same period. Of that total, £4894 were *vadia guerre*, now more precisely styled *vadia Hiberniae*, paid to Reginald Grey of Ruthin and others of the king's *comitina* in Ireland. The prests exceeded £6100, and were higher than those of any period, except 1393-95. In only one other year did *prestita* exceed £5000, and generally they were between three and four thousand. The inference is that the wardrobe was fairly successful in making each year's revenue cover its expenses.

This impression of solvency is deepened when we compare the totals of wardrobe receipts and expenditure for the reign. There were roughly as many balances in favour of the debit as of the credit side; but in the course of the reign they almost cancel out each other. Too much stress must not be laid upon these figures, for all the figures of our accounts are book-keeping figures and have to be understood before they can be interpreted. Thus, the last year is the most surprising year of the reign, for it shows a wardrobe income of nearly ten thousand pounds in excess of the disbursements. But, for the previous term of account, the expenses were some £11,600 in excess of the receipt. Moreover, among the items of the foreign receipt of 1398-99

figures the large sum of £12,438, as "debts to divers persons for victuals."¹ This regarding of debts as an asset is characteristic of the technical nature of the accounts, and serves to warn us to examine the figures carefully before basing conclusions on their evidence. Further complication is introduced by balances and "remnants" being carried from one year's account to another. The figures we have quoted have their value, but they must be taken as indicating general conditions and must never be pressed too far.

The complexity of the accounts is seen in the way in which the "foreign receipt" was built up. The law of the land had long been that the exchequer was to be the source of wardrobe supplies, and it was so far observed that only rarely did small sums of money go to the wardrobe without being accounted for in the national treasury. The comparatively small sums accounted for yearly by the wardrobe as its "foreign receipt" show that Richard II.'s officers seldom broke this law to any serious extent. For 1377-89 foreign receipt roughly averaged £3000 a year: but for 1389-99 this amount was considerably more. For present purposes it will be safer to exclude the anomalous last year, yet even with this exclusion the yearly average of 1389-98 approached £4500, though the enhanced turnover of these later years marks down the foreign receipt as proportionally less than in the earlier part of the reign. Richard did not try to subsidise his wardrobe directly from taxation, because he never aimed at making the wardrobe a regular instrument of government, except in the two Irish expeditions.

Whatever the proportion of foreign receipt to exchequer receipt, an examination of its items reduces it to absolute insignificance. Little enough was "foreign receipt" in the old sense of taxes paid to the wardrobe instead of the exchequer. The most startling sum of all, the foreign receipt of 1398-99, is, as we have seen, the formal entry of debts to creditors ranging over many years. The heaviest yearly item was the recurring

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 5/26: "debita diuersis creditoribus tam pro diuersis victualibus ab eis emptis ad expensas hospicii quam diuersis militibus, clericis, scutiferis et vallettis pro vadiis et robis suis." The idea underlying the entry was probably that of a debt received from the "divers creditors" and therefore treated as a "receipt," despite the obligation of future repayment. Each account only relates to the period it covers.

"remnant," which included both the unexpended balance, if any, of the previous year and the estimated value of the remnant of victuals and stores taken over in the new account. Another permanently large item was the money set down as received from the king's butler as the cost of wines, consumed in the household, or sold and accredited to the wardrobe account. Moreover, stores and beverages, produced on the king's domain, were entered as "foreign receipts," at prices which did not profess to be more than an estimate of their worth. Even the modest fruits of the king's vineyard at Windsor and of his gardens at Westminster, Kennington, Eltham and other suburban manors were duly valued. Here we may remark that the Windsor vineyard only occasionally produced wine, and that of doubtful quality, while in less sunny years its output was "verjuice," the invariable produce of the other royal gardens. But the sour verjuice, just as the wine, was consumed in the household and figured in the accounts, though, like foreign wine handed over in lieu of customs or sent as a contribution towards revenue from Bordeaux, it was always entered as "priceless" in the sense of having cost neither money nor credit to the wardrobe.¹

Foreign receipt also took note of the *incrementum mesure* of the wheat obtained from the king's sergeant of the bakery and purveyor of wheat,² and the sums paid by goldsmiths for worn-out vessels of gold or silver. The same comprehensive category also covered what seem to us far from "foreign receipts," such as the not inconsiderable profits of the jurisdiction of the coroner and clerk of the market of the household, including the *placita aule*, and the goods of felons hanged, and, in the year of the

¹ Thus in 1369-71, "unam pipam vini Anglie de vineto de Wyndesore," was sold by the king's butler, "propter debilitatem." *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 43/1. Again, in March 1384, "ij pipe vini sine pretio" were set down in the foreign receipt as coming from the king's "vinetum" at Windsor. There was also one pipe of "priceless" verjuice from Windsor, 30 "lagene" from the gardens at Shene, 14 "lagene" from Odiham, and 30 from Kennington; *E.A.*, 400/26. In 1388-89 one pipe of red wine from Windsor was consumed in the household; *ib.* 402/5. The "verjuice" from unripe grapes would be more valuable for vinegar than as a beverage.

² Thus in 1383-84 (*E.A.* 400/26) £22 : 19 : 10 accrued from John Colney, "serviente pistrine et emptore frumenti," on account of the "increment" of 1593 quarters 3½ bushels of wheat, bought and expended in the household. It is said that there was one quarter of increment for every quarter purchased, the mean price of wheat being 5s. 9½d. a quarter; but I cannot put any clear meaning to the statement.

peasants' revolt, the modest store of flour belonging to the rebel miller, William Grindcob of St. Albans, forfeited for his treason, and consumed in the household. The sums already mentioned as contributed by the general receiver of queen Anne for the support of the king's household are more legitimately included in the "foreign receipt." "Foreign" was really equivalent to the *recepta aliunde quam de scaccario* of an earlier generation: it meant resources not coming directly from the exchequer. But, as the large "remnants" were based on unused receipts of earlier years, the distinction is more technical than real.

We have seen how fallacious it always was to compare exchequer and wardrobe issues and expenses with the view of determining the share which the wardrobe took in the financial work of the crown. Now that the wardrobe had resolved itself into a spending department only, dependent on the exchequer for nearly all its supplies and devoting itself normally to the management of the king's domestic affairs, such comparisons become more fallacious than ever. There is, however, some small use in contrasting the volume of exchequer and wardrobe transactions, if only to realise the proportionate cost of the running of the household establishment with the gross cost of the management of the English state. The comparison must be exceedingly tentative, largely because of the difficulty in drawing the line between the two aspects of the administration. For instance, the wardrobe receipt from the king's butler partakes of the nature of the customs revenue, which was otherwise entirely a matter for the exchequer, and it would be a grave mistake to think that the wardrobe accounts included the whole of the personal expenses of Richard. Apart from the chamber budget and the small accounts of the great and privy wardrobes, all of which we treat elsewhere, some of the most important disbursements made to gratify Richard's private wishes and tastes are to be gathered from the issue rolls. There were recorded the large sums expended on his building undertakings, and although the wages of some of his retainers were naturally paid by the wardrobe, others were paid directly by the exchequer and were recorded in the issue rolls exclusively. Contrariwise, many expenses normally charged to the wardrobe, such as those for the garrisons and munitions of the border fortresses, may reasonably be regarded

as national expenditure, for which the king was in no wise personally responsible.

Putting aside such considerations for the moment, we have assumed that the standard royal revenue for the latter part of the fourteenth century was in the neighbourhood of £140,000 a year.¹ The normal wardrobe income in peace time after 1389 was about £25,000 a year, and consequently between a fifth and a sixth of the exchequer turnover. In one year only, 1394-95, did the wardrobe receipt approach a third of the exchequer revenue, and that was because the cost of the Irish expedition was charged to the wardrobe. There is indeed a striking contrast between the age of Richard II. and the days of Edward I., when the wardrobe played so much bigger and so much more independent a part in the financial system. Yet, as we have seen, conditions changed, and exhibited something of their earlier characteristics when Richard waged war, although, throughout the latter part of the fourteenth century, the combination of wardrobe and exchequer in a single organised public service made it somewhat a matter of indifference from which source the king procured the money he needed. Although we can acquit Richard of the gross charges levelled against him by chroniclers and poets, we can only calculate his personal spendings by studying the national expenses as a whole, and from them we realise there was more ground for the accusations of his contemporary critics than was apparent at first sight. The king's love of fine clothes, rich jewels, sumptuous tournaments, and magnificent feastings were not the only sources of extravagance. The removal of austere baronial censorship enabled the king to deal more generously with his servants, especially as his financial position was easier than during his minority. An accidental entry in a roll of 1393 shows that from 1377 to 1389 the wages of the officers

¹ Sir James Ramsay's figures in *Genesis of Lancaster*, ii. 100, 389, must not be followed implicitly, but they may perhaps be trusted so far as to form a basis for such a generalisation, though he himself would have given a more conservative estimate, say of £120,000. His more recent studies in *Revenues of the King of England*, ii., contribute little to our knowledge. For one thing, Sir James was no longer interested in the wardrobe when it ceased to collect substantial revenue on its own account. This is only natural, because his main concern was with revenue rather than expenditure. He is substantially correct in stating (*Genesis*, ii. 381) that the wardrobe expenditure "is now (*i.e.* under Richard II.) entirely supplied from the treasury." He might even have pushed that statement a good deal further back.

of the household had so often remained unpaid that, at the time of the final settlement of Pakington's account, they were glad to release the crown from the obligation to pay them their full wages by resigning their claim to one-third on condition they received at once the remaining two-thirds.¹ Like George III., Richard II. used his household as a means of political corruption, and his conception of government was not very different from that of the great nobles who were his worst enemies. The ideal was a specially intimate relation between the domain lands and their lord; a large household of knights, clerks and soldiers; a reserve army of retainers scattered over the country liable to be called up whenever danger came in sight; and liberal pensions, grants and places to keep the followers well affected towards their master. There was no doubt policy in putting as many of these charges as possible on to the general revenue of the country, and we cannot examine the issue rolls of the last years of Richard's reign without becoming conscious of how little the "wardrobe account" took cognisance of even the expenses it was supposed to meet. It was not, therefore, entirely without cause that the chroniclers described Richard's household as uneconomical, and that the poets re-echoed their complaints:

For where was euere ony cristen kynge . that ye euere knewe,
That helde swiche an household . be the half-delle
As Richard in this rewme.²

Our conclusion may well be that the exchequer, like the wardrobe, bears witness to the process of regularisation and normalisation which is so outstanding a feature of Richard II.'s reign. If revenue shrank in one way, there was compensation in another. Thus the reduction in the customs revenue, from the diminished export of raw wool, was compensated by the growth of the English trade in cloth manufactured for export. This prevented any material decline of the customs receipts which were still the sheet anchor of English finance. It was not until 1347 that the customs duties were regularly imposed on exported cloth. All through the second half of the fourteenth century, the export duties on woollen cloth so much increased in volume, that they

¹ *E.A.* 402/3; see later, p. 217, n. 1.

² *Richard the Redeless* in Langland, ed. Skeat, i. 626, and *Pol. Poems*, i. 411-412.

afford eloquent testimony to the prosperity and industrial development, which an age of peace brought with it, despite weak government and strife at home.¹

During Richard II.'s reign a change made in the periods of wardrobe accounting facilitates comparison between wardrobe and exchequer finance. Before then, we have been embarrassed by the fact that, while the exchequer years ran regularly from Michaelmas to Michaelmas, the wardrobe years varied with the regnal years of the sovereign, or with the accidental changes of the keepers and controllers, which naturally took place at all sorts of different times. For rather more than the first four years of Richard II. the difficulty remained. The first four accounts began on July 1 or June 30 owing to the circumstance that Pakington, Richard II.'s first keeper, began his first account on July 1, 1377, eight days after Richard's first regnal year began, on June 22. His first and second accounts ran from July 1 to June 30. They, therefore, almost but not quite corresponded with Richard's regnal years. But his third account began on June 30, 1379, and was continued until September 30, 1381, and therefore covered just two years and a quarter. After that, Pakington's accounts were regularly made up for the period between the "morrow of Michaelmas" and the corresponding date of the next year.

The reform was a useful one and was clearly designed to make wardrobe years correspond with exchequer years, a change the more necessary now that the wardrobe was so completely subordinated to the exchequer. Unfortunately, death does not regard official convenience, and when Pakington died on July 25, 1390, his account automatically ended. Accordingly it ran from September 30, 1389, to July 26, 1390, when John Carp took up his burden.² But the new system was too convenient

¹ These points are well worked out in Prof. Howard L. Gray's "Production and Exportation of English Woollens in the Fourteenth Century" in *E.H.R.* xxxix. 13-35. The development of cloth manufacture in the rural districts resulted in an increase of the prosperity of the city of London, which became more than ever the economic centre of England. This is, of course, correlative to the increased centralisation of government in London.

² The particulars of the 1389-90 account in *E.A.* 402/5 break off the "hospicium" diary after July 26, 1390, but blank pages follow in which the subsequent diary would have been written but for the keeper's death. This doubtless caused the three years' delay in presenting the account. See later, pp. 217-218.

to be abandoned, and Carp's first account, beginning on July 27, 1390, was continued beyond the complete year until September 30, 1391. From that date to the end of the reign the wardrobe and the exchequer years were identical, September 30 to September 30. The curious coincidence between Henry IV.'s accession to the throne on September 30, 1399, and the beginning of the new exchequer year on that very day made even Carp's last account cover a complete exchequer year. Carp's death immediately afterwards made it necessary for this account, like Pakington's last account, to be tendered by executors.

There was now one "financial year" for nearly all departments of state, just as there was a "regnal year" by which events were dated. These "financial" and "regnal" years we have still with us, though the modern "financial year" begins on April 6 instead of on September 30. It is tantalising that the new system was only established when the historian has so little occasion for comparing wardrobe and exchequer accounts. But it is at least another instance of the process of normalisation on which we have so often commented. The confusions natural to the mediaeval mind were becoming distasteful to the man of business of the declining fourteenth century. For all the splitting up of the administration into different branches, financial unity, based on exchequer control, made it desirable for all spending departments, as far as was practicable, to standardise routine.

The same disposition to be more businesslike inclined the wardrobe accounts of Richard II. to be tendered and audited without the vexatious delays experienced earlier. These accounts were now made up, almost regularly, year by year, and except for the adjustments of dates necessary, as we have seen, to bring the wardrobe year into line with the exchequer year, it was exceptional for the account to be longer or shorter in duration than a single complete year. Only two accounts ran for two years or more. These were the accounts of June 30, 1379, to September 30, 1381,¹ and of September 30, 1393, to September 30, 1395.² The exceptional circumstances of these two periods sufficiently explain why the accounts were not presented annually. The

¹ *E.A.* 400/11.

² *Ib.* 402/20.

former covers the troubles of the peasants' revolt; the last the long absence of the king in Ireland, attended by the whole of his household.

Such other delays as occurred were caused by the death of the keeper. Thus, when Pakington's death cut short his last account, the particulars of that broken year were only supplied to the exchequer on April 26, 1393. They were then, quite normally, authenticated by the oath of controller Raddington, who personally declared that all the sums contained in them were true, legal and in the proper form.¹ Neither of the accounts for the preceding years ending on September 30, 1388, and September 30, 1389, respectively, had been presented at Pakington's death. Both, therefore, had to be tendered by his executors, and the latter account was not ready until Michaelmas

¹ *Ib.* 402/5, m. 42d contains this entry made by the exchequer: "Hunc librum, continentem xlvij folia, liberauit hic Baldewynus de Radyngton, contrarotulator hospicii domini regis, per manus suas proprias, xxvj^o die Aprilis, anno xvj^o regni regis Ricardi secundi. Et prestitit sacramentum quod omnes summe in eodem contente vere sunt et legales et debito modo posite." *E.A.* 402/5 is not complete as it stands, containing only 43 folios and beginning abruptly without any record of the receipt. The missing five folios are, however, to be found in *ib.* 402/3, which gives the particulars of the receipt. Among other items is a record of payment of £4666 : 13 : 4 to Carp and his cofferer, Stacy, "pro debitis soluendis." Nor was this the only adjustment necessary. Another item of the receipt records that various knights, clerks, esquires and yeomen of the household released the king of £804 : 5 : 6, being one-third of the sum of £2412 : 16 : 6, allocated and allowed to them in Pakington's time, for their fees and robes up to July 27, 1390, "de qua quidem summa creditores predicti relaxarunt domino regi terciam partem pro duabus partibus inde in manibus habendis"; *E.A.* 402/4. Obviously the controller was not able to present his account until these adjustments had been credited to the wardrobe, except on condition of a large adverse balance against Pakington. As it stands, the account records a large surplus in Pakington's favour. But for the delay, the Pakington estate would have been burdened by a considerable debt to the exchequer. With regard to the question of the arrangement of the exchequer accounts, it is clear that *ib.* 402/3 should be bound together with *ib.* 402/5. This is not the only case where a meticulous revision of the *P.R.O. List and Index of Exchequer Accounts*, xxxv., would increase its usefulness to the historian. The full particulars of Carp's account for 1392-93 can be restored by combining *E.A.* 402/10 and *ib.* 403/22. The delay caused by Pakington's death may perhaps account for other delays. Anyhow, Raddington's controller's book for the period Oct. 1, 1392, to Sept. 30, 1393, was only presented to the exchequer on Oct. 19, 1395; *MS. Ad.* 35,115, where, on p. 52d, is the entry "Hunc librum continentem quinquaginta et unum folia scripta, liberauit hic Baldewynus de Radyngton, contrarotulator hospicii domini regis, per manus suas proprias, xix^o die Octobris anno xix^o regis Ricardi secundi. Et prestitit sacramentum quod omnes summe in eodem contente vere sunt et legales et debito modo posite." But Raddington was punctual enough later, presenting the account for the year ending Sept. 30, 1396, on July 7, 1397.

term 1390-91.¹ There was, however, no serious delay when the situation was complicated by the resignation and death of Carp, immediately after Richard's fall. His account was tendered by his executors, under Henry IV., but they were more prompt than Pakington's executors, and discharged their obligations, extending to Michaelmas 1399, in the course of the Hilary term of 1400.²

We are fortunate in having enrolments of Richard II.'s wardrobe accounts for the whole of his reign.³ These are supplemented by short drafts, generally written on a single membrane or in a small roll, on which the enrolments seem to have been based,⁴ though sometimes the enrolments differ from them slightly. Such variations we may attribute usually to corrections, though sometimes no doubt to error. The only yearly account for which there are not both versions is that for 1398-99, which can only be studied in the enrolled account.

Besides these summaries, there are also the much more detailed "particulars" available for certain years. Most important of all are the daybooks of the *hospicium*, which throw so much light upon the itinerary and expenses of the royal household. Unfortunately, such details survive for four considerable periods only, and those not usually embracing the most critical times. Yet as they are scattered in different parts of the reign, the incidents furnished may be regarded as typical of the king's habits at

¹ For 1387-88 see *E.A.* 401/20, and for 1388-89 see *ib.* 402/1: "Compotus Willelmi de Pakyngton, nuper custodis garderobe hospicii regis, defuncti, Johannis Tochet clerici et Henrici Dauy, executorum testamenti ipsius Willelmi defuncti, sicut continetur in memorandis de anno xiiij^o, inter recorda de termino Michaelis, ex parte rememoratoris thesaurarii, pro eodem defuncto." Unluckily the "particulars" of these accounts have not been preserved, so that we have no specific record of the exact dates of their presentation. The "superplusagium" of expenses over receipts, that is the adverse balance of the latter year, was £2797:14:8½. The record goes on to say, however, "de quibus allocantur eidem (i.e. Pakington) in compoto suo de eadem garderoba ab ultimo die Sept., anno xiii^o usque xxvj^{tum} diem Julii, anno xiiij^o regis huius rotulo compotorum de eadem garderoba . . . m^l. m^l. cc. iiij^{xx} xix. li. viij. s. x. d. ob. q^u." Thus the favourable last year was used to balance the excess of expenses over receipts of its predecessor.

² *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 5/26: "sicut continetur in memorandis de anno primo regis Henrici, in recordis de termino sancti Hilarii, ex parte rememoratoris scaccarii."

³ *ib.* 5/19-26.

⁴ *E.A.* bundles 400-403, *passim*. These are in each case cancelled, as if they had served their purpose, which was doubtless affording the material for the more formal enrolment. Were they furnished by the wardrobe or made in the exchequer?

successive stages of his career. The first book, covering the movements of the household between October 10, 1383, and September 30, 1384,¹ illustrates the latter end of the minority. The second comprises the important period of Richard's personal assumption of power, ranging from October 1, 1389, to July 20, 1390.² The other two are concerned with the period during which the chief moves towards autocracy were made. The earlier of them includes nearly two years between October 1, 1392, and August 29, 1394;³ and the other takes up the story, after more than a year's break, from October 1, 1395, to September 30, 1396.⁴

On the whole, the particulars, though valuable in themselves, do not add much to our information as to the general position of the household. They do suggest, however, that, at first, things went on very much as they had done in the days of Edward III., certain modifications only slowly manifesting themselves. Normally the household was established in some royal manor in the neighbourhood of London, but seldom actually in London. In the records of 1383-84 we see that Sheen had become the most frequent resting-place of the nomadic court. The *hospicium* was there for one hundred and twenty-five days, nearly three times as long as it stayed at Eltham, Havering and Langley, the other most favoured royal manors in London's vicinity. Windsor had little attraction. The almost obligatory visit to celebrate with proper solemnity St. George's Day, on April 23, took the household there for no more than eight days, and only one other visit, of six days' duration, was paid to it. A stay of thirty-one days at Clarendon represents the only visit made at any distance from London, and that was necessitated by the meeting of parliament at Salisbury between April 29 and May 27, 1384. Clarendon manor was only two miles from Salisbury, so that the king could more

¹ *Ib.* 401/2; Pakington's accounts for 7-8 Richard II., the first complete book of particulars for the reign.

² *Ib.* 402/5, 3. These are Raddington's controller's book delivered at the exchequer on Apr. 26, 1393, and containing 48 folios; see above, p. 217, n. 1. *E.A.* 402/4, the account of Pakington's executors, adds a few useful details.

³ *Ib.* 402/10, particulars of Carp's account from Sept. 30, 1392, to Sept. 30, 1393, and *ib.* 402/20, Carp's particulars from Sept. 30, 1393, to Aug. 29, 1394. *Ib.* 403/22 seems a part of Carp's 1392-93 account that has gone astray. *MS. Ad.* 35,115 is a daybook of Carp's "hospicium" expenses for the same period. See above, p. 217, n. 1.

⁴ *Ib.* 403/10. Raddington's controller's book, Sept. 30, 1395-Sept. 30, 1396.

easily attend the stormy debates there than he could, when at Sheen, travel to and fro to meet his parliaments at Westminster.

Richard soon began to follow his grandfather's example of withdrawing himself from the household and taking journeys on his own account. Thus, in February 1384, he left the *hospicium* at Sheen, while he went to Canterbury and Rochester,¹ but such freedom was exceptional in these early years. The assiduity with which the officers of the household resided at court is in itself evidence of the normal presence there of the closely watched sovereign. A good reason was required to justify their absence *extra curiam*, especially as the allowances for expenses were proportionate to their rank. In this year of 1383-84 the most frequent absentee was the steward Montague, who was away forty-five days attending councils, normally held at Westminster. Keeper Pakington was absent thirty-six days and Carp, the cofferer, was away for thirty days, going from divers places to London to seek for supplies of money from the exchequer. Raddington, the controller, held the record, with only fifteen days' absence, "on divers business touching the household." Throughout this year the court never moved far from London, save for the Salisbury parliament and a subsequent hunting tour in the New Forest. Then it went back to its usual haunts in Sussex and Surrey; not for a single day was the household at Westminster.

It is to be regretted that no detailed rolls illustrate the movements of the *hospicium* in the troubled years between 1386 and 1388. The Scottish expedition, and Richard's wanderings through Midlands and north in 1387, when he fled in disgust from

¹ The titulus "eleemosyna" in the wardrobe accounts gives clear evidence of the absences of the king from court when he made offerings in person or attended services in churches in places where we know the "*hospicium*" was not established. Other expenses may also sometimes prove the king's whereabouts. Such offerings and payments do not, of course, always involve the king's presence. He need not, for instance, have made a personal offering on May 30, 1384, at Westminster, though there is an entry in *E.A.* 401/2f.39d, "pro secretis expensis domini regis apud Westmonasterium, die xxx^o Maii, anno presenti." But when we read in *ib.* f. 37 that he offered 6s. 8d. at Christ Church, Canterbury "in adventu suo ibidem" on Feb. 16, or that he made other offerings at a requiem mass for his father "eodem die," it is clear that he was at Canterbury. Again, on Feb. 20, he made other offerings, one "ad feretrum sancti Augustini in recessu suo de ibidem." And on Feb. 24 he made offerings at Rochester Cathedral "in adventu suo ibidem." The roll shows that the "*hospicium*" was at Sheen between Feb. 17 and Mar. 7.

London, would have been made much clearer by the elucidation such records afford. But the roll of 1389-90 invites comparison with that of 1383-84. While not suggesting any great revolution in court habits, it shows that the household was more mobile now than it had been six years earlier. Its wanderings were still limited to the home counties, and Sheen remained the favourite spot, though Kennington, the home of Richard's childhood, and Eltham, as much enjoyed by him as by his grandfather, were also often visited.¹ Of more distant places, Woodstock, with its facilities for hunting, was most frequented, though Windsor and Easthampstead were good seconds. In the summer the king went further afield, getting as far into Wiltshire as Devizes in July, and in the latter part of the month spending time in the Midlands, notably Leicester and Nottingham.

In 1392-94 the king travelled more widely, though the roll only begins after his reconciliation with the Londoners made him abandon the plan to remove the government to Nottingham and York. Once more, Richard stayed persistently in the south, now wandering from one manor to another in quest of sport, now spending short intervals in great monasteries, and once, at Salisbury, passing the summer days with the Franciscan friars to celebrate the Assumption of St. Mary.² These visits to great churches bring out the piety of Richard, which is also illustrated by the large number of sermons preached before him, nearly always by members of one of the four orders of friars, who received large rewards for their services. To hear a friar preach in a Benedictine abbey seemed to give Richard peculiar satisfaction.

During these years the court's mobility was somewhat restricted by the illness and death of the queen. The result was that two hundred and seventy-one days were spent at Sheen, one hundred and fifteen at Windsor, ninety-three at Langley and forty-two at Eltham. Queen Anne died at Sheen. Afterwards

¹ Sixty-four nights at Sheen, sixty-three at Kennington and fifty-two at Eltham.

² *MS. Ad.* 35,115: "apud fratres minores," Aug. 14-Aug. 17, 1393. There are curious small variations between this and *E.A.* 402/10, though officially the keeper's and controller's rolls were supposed to be duplicates. Thus *MS. Ad.* intercalates on Feb. 11, 1393, a night at Alton, between Winchester and Farnham, and shows that in the period June 22-July 11, set down in *E.A.* for Windsor, June 25 to July 11 were spent by part of the household at Easthampstead.

Richard pulled down the manor house in which he had spent so much of his time with her. Westminster, though not high on the list with only twenty-four days, was more visited than in the earlier years. Winchester, where twenty-seven days were spent, owed its position in the list to the king's attendance at the Winchester parliament. The longest stay at Westminster was made for the burial of the queen, and for the final arrangements for Richard's first visit to Ireland.¹ When the king's movements became vitally interesting, the *hospicium* roll came to an end.

The last roll, from October 1, 1395, to September 30, 1396, shows the greater freedom enjoyed by a king who knew that he was master. Long sojourns in one place were exceptional. Windsor (sixty-three days) and Langley (fifty-three days) were the most favoured, especially Windsor, for twenty-six days spent at Easthampstead may be added to the time passed within its forest. Eltham and Havering received visits of only twenty days each, and Berkhamstead, Kennington, and of course Sheen, never saw the *hospicium* at all. The large amount of time spent in the Midlands, culminating in the forty-eight days spent at Nottingham, reminds us of 1392. But the king also made a western progress in January 1396, visiting many great abbeys, such as Gloucester, Tewkesbury and Worcester, where he attended the enthronement of his old physician, Tideman of Winchcomb, as its bishop. Then he worked his way eastwards to Nottingham, where he stayed from January 29 to March 15, and thence moved slowly to York, where he spent Easter day, and back to Windsor for the feast of St. George, and to Westminster for the anniversary of queen Anne on June 7. The plans for his second marriage later kept Richard in the south and twice took him to Calais, where the roll leaves him at the beginning of his second visit.

These movements of kings and courts are not intrinsically valuable, and shed only scanty and refracted illumination on any aspect of administrative history. The one important exception is the real light which the wardrobe accounts of 1394 throw upon the preparations for Richard's first visit to Ireland. Fragmentary as they are, they indicate that, when the king was about to lead his host to battle, the household became something of what it had been in the days of Edward I. But the value of the armed

¹ For details see iii. 485-487, above.

household in peace time was at once destroyed by the fatuity which took it to Ireland in 1399, and by the refusal of the household forces, on their return, to lift a finger to help their master.

A few other general observations on Richard's wardrobe may, in conclusion, be hazarded. The first point to be emphasised is the increasing laicisation of the household. This followed inevitably from the increasing development of its military element, which brought about the natural introduction of knights and squires to offices like the controllership, up to the end of Edward III.'s reign regarded as exclusively clerical. Even when arrayed for war, the household of Edward I. had been controlled by the wardrobe clerks, but the position occupied by the Langtons, the Kirkbys and the Bensteads of Edward I.'s Welsh and Scottish wars was much more dominating than that which their humble successors, the Pakingtons, the Carps and the Stacys of Richard's reign enjoyed. Then the clerical side of the household took the lead; now the soldiers held the first place, not only in the fighting line but in the organisation of victory, though the forms were still the same. The wardrobe clerk still followed the king, with his modest *comitiua* of fighting men, but he had no directive share in the struggle. The Raddingtons and Stanleys broke up the unity of the old *camera clericorum*. Above them, the lay officers of the household towered more powerfully than ever. The steward and the chamberlain not only controlled the household but also inspired the king's policy. The changes came from no conscious design, but simply from the altered circumstances of the age. The use made of the household by Richard II. for military purposes showed that the old machinery was there, and was ready for use when a ruler with brains and character wished to use it. If it failed under Richard II., it was because nothing ever succeeded under that most incoherent and irresponsible of would-be despots.

Now the wardrobe had ceased to be the directive force of the household, and remained simply as the office of household accounts. For long it had been definitely described as the wardrobe of the household, and its keeper and controller, keeper and controller of the household. The very name of wardrobe began to disappear, or rather to lose the meaning previously

attached to it, and to be appropriated for its exclusive use by the great wardrobe, which, under Richard II., was normally referred to as "the wardrobe."

There was another somewhat unexpected result of the restrictions imposed upon the wardrobe. Although we should have imagined its increasingly domestic functions would have involved stricter obligation to follow the court, it was coming to be regarded as a London, rather than as a perambulating, office. Several small indications, which must not, however, be unduly pressed, illustrate this. For instance, the wardrobe keeper often had a house in London assigned to him for his residence, and wardrobe accounts were commonly enrolled under the heading, or catchword, *London*. From Pakington's first account onwards, the formula *Item London*, generally preceded the enrolment. Perhaps it was only meant to help the official investigator seeking to find his way about the rolls, and would not, in itself, afford a basis for the view of the increasing identification of the wardrobe with the capital.¹ The constant confusion of the wardrobe and the great wardrobe, permanently localised in the city, may partly explain the catchword. It is certain that Richard was no fonder of London and the Londoners than was his grandfather, and, constant as were the wanderings of king and household, they seldom visited London or even Westminster. After 1397 Richard hardly ventured to show his face at Westminster, unless protected by a strong guard, although Westminster Hall was then being rebuilt. Yet the economic importance of London and the political activity of its leading citizens were growing rapidly. From 1397 there was a tendency, threatened in 1392, to transfer the administration to the Midlands, but it had not developed far before Richard's fall, and it did little to retard the process

¹ It is not even an invariable catchword, for in 1385-86 Pakington's account in *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 5/20 is headed "Kanc'.," that is, of course, Kent; but even under this year there is the concluding reference, "Et respice in rotulo xj in residuum London." Compare *ib.* for 1386-87: "Allocatur Willelmo de Pakyngton in rotulis xi° et xiiij°. Item London." Compare *ib.* m. 23, which begins "London" and ends, speaking of the "superplusagium" of the year, "quia allocatur eodem custodi in rotulo xxij° in adhuc residuum London." This went on to the end of the reign. Thus in Carp's 1397-98 account, the "superplusagium" was "allocatum Johanni Carpe in rotulo xi° primi anni Henrici III. in residuum London."

of concentrating the machinery of state on the banks of the Thames.

The futility of Richard II.'s policy does not alone account sufficiently for the decline of the wardrobe during his reign. Henry IV., in succeeding to his cousin's throne, had no scruple in appropriating to his own service the administrative devices for using which, to the full, Richard was deposed. When a strong king, like Henry V., took over the reins of government, it was found that the ruler could still use the household effectively enough in the organisation of great campaigns. Yet, even with the victor of Agincourt, things were not as they had been. The wardrobe was no longer a branch of the personal service of the sovereign, following all his wishes and faithfully executing his commands; it was just the accounting department of the household, not the household itself, and only in war time assumed politically important functions. The fact that, under Henry V. and Henry VI., the treasurer of the household was also frequently treasurer of the wars,¹ proves how little real distinction there remained between service of the court, and service of the state. The household was, then, part of the great national system of administration, in which the king was still the most powerful factor, but in no wise the autocrat. There is some little significance in the accidental circumstance that the last account of the wardrobe of the household enrolled after the traditional fashion was the last account of our period, namely the account tendered by Carp's executors in the early weeks of the reign of Henry IV. Although generally the revolution in 1399 marked no great epoch in administrative history, it forms a convenient point at which to pause in the history of the wardrobe of the household.

¹ See, for instance, *E.A.* 408/9 and 13, the accounts of John Hotoft and of John Tirell, keepers of the wardrobe of the household and treasurers of war for 8-9 and 9-15 Henry VI. respectively. The accounts of Walter Philipps, treasurer of wars for 9 Henry V. to 1 Henry VI., were enrolled as a wardrobe account, the only instance of this being done after 1399; *Enrolled Foreign Accounts*, p. 103; *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, ix.

CHAPTER XIII

THE LATER HISTORY OF THE CHAMBER, 1327-1399

SECTION I

INTRODUCTORY

THE history of the king's chamber in the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II. divides itself naturally into three periods. These range respectively from 1327 to 1333, from 1333 to 1355, and from 1356 to 1399. Though the divisions are clear, the dividing lines between them can only be roughly drawn. Each great change was prepared for gradually and the clearing away of the older fashions was prolonged into the new phase. Nor were any of the changes so drastic as to prevent men regarding the chamber as a single continuous unity.

The epochs in chamber history were determined mainly by the changes made in providing the department with funds. There were three chief ways in which this could be done. One was by grants of money to meet obligations as they arose; the second was by assigning the chamber a definite yearly allowance, calculated to cover its ordinary expenses; and the third was by endowing it with an estate from whose proceeds the chamber, like the king, might be expected to "live of its own." By the first two methods supplies would come, directly or indirectly, from the exchequer, whose supreme control over finance had been permanently secured by the Stapeldon reforms. The third method implied the assignment to the chamber of special blocks of lands, from the rent of which an income adequate for normal expenditure might be derived. It allowed, however, little margin for extraordinary expenditure,

which, when necessary, would still have to be met by the exchequer.

The experimental attempts to establish a landed estate for the chamber formed the real stages in its history. We have seen that, under Edward II., this method had been tried between 1309 and 1326, in 1322 on a large scale, then, after a few months, in a more restricted manner. Reservation of lands to the chamber was so markedly a feature of the policy of the Despensers that there was inevitably a strong reaction against it after the revolution of 1326. In consequence, the whole system of landed reservation was deliberately abandoned. As no alternative means of support were provided, the chamber lived a restricted and inconspicuous life during the whole of the minority of Edward III., and for the first two or three years after he came into possession of power. The only matter of real importance with which the chamber was concerned, during this period, was the clearing up of the arrears of accounts for the lands which the chamber had ceased to administer.

When Edward III. became king in fact, as well as in name, he began to revive the chamber system of his father's days. The first step in this direction was taken in 1332-33, when a return was made to the policy of reserving lands to the chamber. The change involved not only increased resources, but a considerable addition to the chamber staff to administer these lands. For more than twenty years this system had a fair trial. The fact that it was continued for so long is the more interesting, because the beginnings of the great war with France put a strain on the king's finances which tested the soundness of every part of the administrative structure. The result, in the end, was that the reservation of lands was found useless. It failed to provide the chamber with a sufficient regular income and was unsatisfactory as breaking up that unity of ultimate control which was necessary in order to husband the national resources. The first indication of the decline of the system came in 1349, when lands began to be "reserved for the expenses of the household" under the jurisdiction of the wardrobe instead of that of the chamber,¹ and the weight of exchequer authority was used in an attempt to make accountability to the

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, pp. 31, 32, 51, 105.

chamber a reality.¹ After more tentative experiments with exchequer grants, the chamber estate was abolished with dramatic suddenness in 1356. At this point ends the second and most interesting of our three periods.

The third period was established when a large annual grant from the exchequer was substituted for the landed estate of the chamber. This method prevailed for the rest of the century, and after its adoption the history of the chamber became less complicated. Naturally the special staff called into existence by the need of administering large territorial possessions disappeared, and with it the danger of the chamber lands becoming, as they had threatened to become in 1322, a state within the state, specially governed in the interests of the personal prerogative of the crown. How dead this ideal was is seen by the fact that Richard II., in the days of his autocracy, never attempted to develop the chamber on the lines contemplated by the Despensers. Accordingly, from 1356 to 1399, the history of the chamber preserves an essential continuity, and may be best studied in a single survey, for the change in sovereign was of minor importance.

The three periods must now be discussed in detail. It will be convenient to examine the various aspects of chamber activity, revenue and resources, staffing and administration, separately within the chronological limits of each of the subsequent sections of this long chapter.

¹ See below, pp. 284-285.

SECTION II

REACTION, 1327-1333

An immediate result of the fall of Edward II. was that the practice of reserving lands for the service of the king's chamber was discontinued. The change in policy was envisaged as soon as John Stratford, the Lancastrian bishop of Winchester, became, as lieutenant of the treasurer, responsible for the exchequer. Thus, as early as November 17, 1326, in appointing a new keeper for the chamber manors of Cookham and Bray, Stratford instructed him to answer for their issues at the exchequer.¹ Similarly the two auditors of the chamber—Richard Winfarthing and Richard Iken²—who, like most officials, seem to have remained at their posts when the king fled to Wales, were, on November 22, ordered to appear at the exchequer “with regard to certain matters especially touching the king for which it is needful to have special tractate with you.”³ This discussion was doubtless concerned with the problem of the future of the chamber estate. What the final result of such discussion would be was made clear in the course of December, when several groups of chamber manors, whose custody was granted or restored to “contrariant” claimants, were expressly bestowed on condition of accountability to the exchequer.⁴

The abolition of the chamber estate was made easy by the unpopularity of chamber administration in the districts subjected to it. In the parliament of January-February 1327 the men of

¹ *M.R.K.R.* 103/6. “Ita quod de exitibus inde provenientibus respondeat hic.” The account with the exchequer was to run from Michaelmas.

² See for these men, above, ii. 347-348. They had been in office since 1324. Their colleague, Robert Holden, also controller of the wardrobe, had dropped out through his adherence to Edward II.; see above, iii. 4-6. He died soon afterwards.

³ *M.R. L.T.R.* 99/93d. “Super quibusdam negotiis nos specialiter tangentibus pro quibus oportet tractatum vobiscum specialiter habere.” Both Winfarthing and Iken obeyed this mandate.

⁴ *C.F.R.* iii. 423, 424, 431, records the custody of Scarborough by Henry Percy, Iselhamptstead by Maud Botetourt, Temple Guyting by bishop Orleton, Glatton and Holme by Thomas Wake. These appointments were all made in December 1326. All these places were previously under the chamber, but the new keepers were to answer for them at the exchequer.

the chamber lands petitioned that they might henceforth compute at the exchequer and not at the chamber. The royal answer was favourable. The new king was made to promise to address a writ of chancery to the exchequer, bidding it to hear the account of all those who would account before it for lands and tenements previously answered for in the chamber of the late king, and "to do further upon the same accounts what is to be done for the ending thereof."¹ On March 13, there was a conference on this matter between Adam Orleton, now treasurer, and Sir Walter Norwich, still chief baron, with others of the king's council. On March 14 the king and council agreed, not only that all keepers, bailiffs and receivers of manors, lands and tenements, reserved to the chamber by Edward II., should render to the exchequer their unaudited accounts and arrears, but also that the auditors of the accounts which had been already rendered to the chamber should go to the exchequer on April 20, the morrow of the close of Easter, to deliver to the treasurer and barons the rolls of those accounts and all other memoranda relating to them.² Categorical orders were issued to such auditors, and to all holders of lands under Edward II.'s chamber, to attend the Easter session of the exchequer, and account there for the whole period of their custody for which they had not already accounted in the chamber. The terms of the writs and the description of the auditors as "former auditors," and of the keepers as "former keepers," show that the chamber manors were at an end.³

The restoration of contrariants to their possessions had already made great breaches in the chamber estate. The decisive blow

¹ *Rot. Parl.* ii. 432. The petition is undated and is only extant in a late English version in *MS. Harl.* 252/143; but it can hardly belong to the petitions of any other parliament. Along with it is included (p. 434a) a petition of Thomas Cobham, bishop of Worcester, who died on Aug. 27, 1327. Compare too *ib.* p. 436, which gives the date as Feb. 24.

² *M.R.K.R.* 103/151; *L.T.R.* 99/33.

³ *Ib.* and *K.R.* 103/151d, 153; *L.T.R.* 99/33d, and a schedule in French sewn to m. 101: "Et concordatum est per eundem thesaurarium et barones et alios de consilio regis quod tam prefati quam alii qui habuerunt custodiam terrarum de quibus rex Edwardus, pater regis nunc, voluit respondere in camera sua veniant hic ad scaccarium ad computandum de toto tempore quo habuerunt custodiam terrarum predictarum et nondum computauerunt in camera predicta." The exchequer writs ordering such appearance for April 20, are in *ib.* m. 102, and enumerate the chamber manors at the moment of the abolition of the system. Regrants, all with accountability to the exchequer, had gravely diminished the list given above in ii. 352.

came on February 1, when, as a result of parliamentary action, Isabella's dower was augmented by lands worth £8800 a year. Among them were typical chamber manors, such as Burstwick, Tickhill, Rockingham, the two Langleys, Sheen and Isleworth.¹ The total value of the lands thus detached from the chamber estate exceeded £1800 a year. When Langley was receiver, the annual chamber revenue was not more than £2000.² It was, therefore, only to confirm a foregone conclusion that the March conferences on the fate of the chamber lands were held. Already, when the sheriffs came to the exchequer with their Easter accounts, the whole of Isabella's lands had been withdrawn from their jurisdiction.³

For the period 1327-30, all that the exchequer had to do with former chamber lands was to insist upon the accounts being tendered for which their former custodians were not yet acquitted,

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1327-30, pp. 66-69. Isabella's original dower had been £4500. It was now increased to 20,000 marks. The former chamber lands granted to Isabella included Glatton and Holme, Hunts.; Hadleigh and Thunderley, Essex; Gravesend, Kent; Crookham, Berks.; Cippenham, Langley Marsh and Wraysbury, Bucks.; Chiltern Langley, Herts.; Byfleet and Sheen, Surrey; Isleworth, Middlesex; Rockingham, Northants; Wheatley and Gringley, Notts.; Burstwick, Cowick, Snaith and Tickhill, Yorks. The exact valuation of all the chamber lands cannot be given, as in some cases they are grouped with non-chamber lands in a single valuation. But Burstwick, the most valuable, was worth £800 a year; Tickhill, £333:15:9; and Cowick, £50. Accordingly Yorkshire provided two-thirds of the revenue thus derived. A few chamber manors, originally given to Isabella, were soon detached from her possession, notably Temple Newsam, Templehurst, Strode and Denny, given for life on Mar. 13 to Mary, countess of Pembroke; *C.P.R.*, 1327-30, p. 37; compare *C.F.R.* iv. 42. But Mary gave up vastly greater possessions, such as Hertford, which, as the dates above show, was granted to Isabella six weeks before its prior tenant relinquished it. Similarly, other grantees of chamber lands surrendered them to Isabella. In return for them, a similar or, more often, a greater amount of land was provided elsewhere. This arrangement suggests that the queen had a first lien upon chamber lands and required large compensation for giving them up. Thus Gilbert of Elsfield yielded to her Cricklade, when receiving the chamber manor of Easthampstead; *C.P.R.*, 1327-30, p. 36. Similarly John Wysham paid through the nose for Faxfleet; *ib.* p. 95. William Clinton received Henley, near Guildford, as a partial redemption of a promise made by Isabella; *ib.* p. 174. A very few chamber manors, such as Clipstone and Howrah park, remained in the king's hands. Mr. S. T. Gibson's thesis on the "Minority of Edward III." includes lists of the lands granted to Isabella, noting the dates of the surrender of such that she was forced to resign in October 1330, and the new disposal of the former chamber manors. ² Above, ii. 348, n. 2.

³ This comes out in *C.F.R.* iv. 167, when the honour of Pontefract was, on Feb. 12, 1330, handed from Isabella to the custody of the sheriff of Yorks. He was to answer for the issues at the exchequer now that it was returned to the king's hand. He clearly had no responsibility when Isabella held it. See later, vol. v. ch. xviii. § I.

and upon the surrender of all chamber records in their keeping.¹ The same difficulties seem to have delayed the conclusion of the chamber accounts as impeded the winding up of the arrears of wardrobe accountability. The accounting officers were summoned to account at the Easter exchequer of 1327, but few were able to satisfy the exchequer so quickly. Even adherents of the new *régime* were slow to act. Of the two auditors, Winfarthing came and surrendered his records, but not, as was afterwards found out, all of them.² His colleague Iken neither came nor made any return to the writ.³ The same quickening-up process was now applied to both sets of arrears. On October 3, 1329, the treasurer and barons were directed to summon all receivers of the moneys, jewels and other things pertaining to the late king's chamber to render their accounts thereof before them.⁴ The breadth of these instructions extended accountability to the exchequer from the custodians of individual chamber manors to the keepers and receivers of the chamber as a whole. In this we may recognise a notable triumph of the exchequer over its sometime rival, though many months were still to elapse before the chamber clerks of Edward II. were all brought to book. They delayed with their accounts, and some, for instance Winfarthing, were dead, so that their executors had to answer for them. The pedantry of the exchequer further delayed the settlement. In accordance with precedent, it insisted on written warranties for payments and written commissions for appointments, before it would grant a quittance. The easy-going chamber officers, who had often acted on verbal orders of the king, were thus reduced to helplessness. Only after repeated mandates from chancery, would the stiff exchequer clerks allow the disputed items.

In the spring of 1330 further steps were taken to hasten the process. On March 16 and 18 the exchequer was ordered to summon before it all receivers responsible to Edward II.'s chamber, who had not accounted "according to the law and

¹ *M.R.K.R.* 103/151, 153; *L.T.R.* 99/33, 33d. "Quod mittant hic omnes rotulos penes ipsos existentes . . . thesaurario et baronibus huius seaccarii liberandos"; *K.R.* 104/237d.

² *Ib.* *L.T.R.* 99/33, 102d.

³ *Ib.* 102d. "Ad quem diem non venit nec breue retornauit."

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 491.

custom of the exchequer.”¹ Yet even the trifling account of Richard of Lusteshull, receiver between 1315 and 1321,² could only procure enrolment in 4 Edward III.³ The accounts of William Langley,⁴ were equally delayed. The exchequer would not audit them because his four controllers could not produce their commissions of appointment. A complaint from William resulted in a stern mandate, in April 1330, to the exchequer to receive the controllers and audit the account.⁵ Like difficulties delayed the account of Langley’s predecessor, James of Spain. On June 6 Ousefleet, the first of the controllers, produced his controller’s book⁶ and the audit of his account soon terminated, although it was only in 1335 that all his records were transferred to exchequer custody.⁷ Not until Michaelmas 1336 did the exchequer accept the declaration of Winfarthing’s executors that

¹ *M.R.K.R.* 106/70d. The writs are perhaps worth printing :

(a) “B. pro rege. Rex etc. Mandamus vobis quod venire faciatis coram vobis ad dictum scaccarium omnes clericos et alios, qui fuerunt receptores denariorum domini Edwardi, nuper regis Anglie patris nostri, in camera sua, ad reddendum nobis compota sua de omnibus receptis et liberationibus suis, et compota illa audiat, et ulterius in hac parte faciatis quod secundum legem et consuetudinem scaccarii predicti fuerit faciendum. Et hoc nullatenus omittatis. Teste me ipso, apud Wyntoniam, xvi die Marcii, a.r.n. quarto.”

(b) “Rex etc. Quia per concilium nostrum ordinauimus quod de exitibus terrarum et tenementorum quas celebris memorie dominus Edwardus, nuper rex Anglie, pater noster, commisit diuersis ad respondendum ei inde in camera sua, et unde non fuit sic responsum, nobis ad scaccarium nostrum respondeatur, necnon de arreragiis compotorum, si que habeantur, in compotis illis qui redditi fuerant in camera predicta, nobis debite satisfiat, vobis mandamus quod, scrutatis rotulis et memorandis de scaccario predicto super commissionibus factis in forma predicta, et visis compotis in camera predicta reddit, compotum super premissis audiri et arreragia leuari faciatis, secundum legem et consuetudinem scaccarii predicti. Teste me ipso, apud Wyntoniam, xviii° die Marcii, a.r.n. quarto. Per consilium.”

Though both are in the normal form of letters close, neither is entered in the close roll. It would be an interesting, though troublesome, minor investigation to ascertain what proportion of the writs close the exchequer recorded in the memoranda roll are not enrolled in the close roll, and why.

² See above, ii. 329-330. Lusteshull was “supervisor et custos” of Byfleet, Thunderley, Shene, the two Langleys and other chamber lands. His successor, Humphrey Walden, was appointed on May 6, 1321.

³ *Chanc. Roll*, 123/38d (4 Edw. III.).

⁴ See above, ii. 344-346 and 348.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 27-28. See also above, ii. 344. Three controllers appeared, but Robert Holden was dead and represented by his executors. Holden’s account extended till Oct. 31, 1326.

⁶ *E.H.R.* xxx. 673.
⁷ *M.R. L.T.R.* 99/33. On Jan. 21, 1335, Ousefleet “misit hic . . . quondam librum compoti de receptis predicti Thome in camera predicta continentem xxxij folia, qui remanet in custodia rememoratoris thesaurarii.”

they had sent to it all his records in their keeping.¹ Such delays explain the tardiness with which the chamber accounts of Edward II. were passed by the exchequer. Yet some good accrued to the exchequer from its tenacity. The liability of the chamber to account at the exchequer had often been disputed. The successful assertion of the principle was no trifling indication of the influence of the doctrine of the ordinances that exchequer control on all matters of finance was universal in its extent. Historians too may well thank the exchequer for its stubbornness in insisting on the delivery of records to it. It was now that the valuable chamber accounts of the last years of Edward II. reached that safe custody which has preserved them until this day.

Under these conditions, there is little surviving information as to the operations of the chamber of Edward III. between 1327 and 1330. The references to the chamber in the chancery rolls are as scanty and unilluminating as are those of the reign of Edward I. They simply record small pensions granted out of the chamber and loans by foreign bankers paid into it.² Such other moneys as the chamber received were doled out to it in small sums from the wardrobe.³ In the same way the officers of the chamber seem to have been obscure persons whose names can barely be traced. The chamberlain of the period, Gilbert Talbot, was a knight of some position; but he was "of the quarrel of Thomas of Lancaster"⁴ and therefore of no mind to magnify the chamberlainship, as it had been magnified by his predecessor, the younger Despenser. The only clerk whose name has been recorded was

¹ *ib.* 33. "Ad quod diem predicti executores retornauerunt hic ad eundem diem breue suum indorsatum sic . . . et nichil aliud penes nos remanet quod vobis mittere possimus ulterius. Quod quidem breue sic indorsatum est inter breuia . . . de anno decimo huius regis." The exchequer was then at York.

² For instance, *C.P.R.*, 1327-30, p. 371, grant on Mar. 4, 1329, of a pension of 40 marks to a cardinal out of the king's chamber; *ib.* p. 461, Nov. 23, 1329, acknowledgment of the king's debt to the Bardi for a loan of £300, paid into the chamber by Richard of Bury.

³ *E.A.* 384/1, p. 31. "Liberata domino regi in camera sua ad faciendum inde voluntatem suam" (May 27, 1329), or "ad dandum diuersis pro voluntate sua apud Ambianum" (June 4).

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 38. It seems as if stress were laid on keeping the chamber in Lancastrian hands. *Ann. Paul.* p. 340, say that in the Northampton parliament of February to March 1328, when some anti-Lancastrians lost office, Thomas Wake, Lancaster's son-in-law and partisan, was made chamberlain. This may have been attempted, but it was not carried through, for Talbot was in office both on Mar. 1 and May 12 of that year and afterwards; *ib.* pp. 371, 387.

Thomas Gargrave, "clerk of the king's chamber," who was holding office in May 1330.¹

Both Talbot and Gargrave welcomed the fall of Mortimer, and had their reward for their worship of the rising sun. Talbot succeeded Mortimer as justice of West Wales.² Gargrave was prominently engaged in sequestrating the lands and chattels of the fallen earl of March.³ One important name is mentioned vaguely in connection with the chamber business of these years. When in 1331 Edward III. went to France to hold an interview with Philip VI. at Pont-Sainte-Maxence, Bury, already keeper of the privy seal, accompanied him and acted as paymaster of the expedition, receiving in the king's chamber considerable sums from the Bardi and others towards its expenses.⁴ This looks as if Bury was both clerk of the chamber and keeper of the privy seal, the more so since an obscure reference in the memoranda rolls, makes him receive moneys in the chamber so late as in 1333. The transaction may of course be earlier than its record.⁵

A king, who was a minor and acting under tutelage, could not have an active chamber. Such an office postulated a strong-

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1327-30, p. 518.

² *C.F.R.* iv. 194. He was acting on Oct. 23, 1330.

³ *Ib.* iv. 218, 226; *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, p. 65.

⁴ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/34. "Compotus Ricardi de Bury, clerici, Willelmi de Northwell attornati sui, de receptis et expensis factis in passagio regis versus partes Francie, mense Aprilis, anno quinto." The dates were April 2 to May 6: the receipt £1309 : 15 : 7½, and the expense £1316 : 15 : 2. Most of it was lent by the Bardi, partly through the exchequer, but also to the amount of £300 "in denariis eidem Ricardo in camera regis liberatis." The amount spent shows how exaggerated is the story in Murimuth (p. 63), and Baker (p. 48), that the king went in disguise or in great privacy. *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 122, gives an acknowledgment of the debt.

⁵ *M.R.K.R.* 110, breu. dir. bar. m. 31d. This is a privy seal writ of Feb. 6, 1333; but Bury was then keeper of the privy seal, and there is no reason for not believing that the transaction referred to as the receipt of moneys in chamber by Bury, "our dear clerk," from John Wodehouse, clerk of the hanaper, may not have referred to a transaction of any time after 1328, when Wodehouse became clerk of the hanaper. The writ runs as follows: "Come nostre cher cler, Richard de Bury, eit receu en nostre chambre par nostre comandement quarante livres de nostre cher clerk Johanne de Wodehous, gardeyn del hanaper de nostre chancellerie, des issues du dit hanaper, vous mandoms qe la dite somme de quarante livres facetz duement allouer au dit Johanne sur soen accoute en manere come apert. Done souz nostre priue seal a Euerwyk, le vi jour de fevrier, lan de nostre regne septisme. Hoc breue allocatur in compoto eiusdem Johannis," etc. The story as above, in iii. 27-28, about Bury writing with his own hand a signet letter, would further suggest a connection between him and the chamber in which the secret seal or signet was kept.

willed king, intent on exploiting his power and on keeping authority in his own hands.

We must not, therefore, attribute exclusively to the special circumstances, brought about by the revolution of 1326, the decline of the chamber during the minority of Edward III. Fifty years later we shall have to notice that chamber operations were similarly curtailed during the nonage of Richard II. The chamber did not at once change its ways when Edward III. began to govern as well as to reign. The final auditing of the chamber accounts of Edward II. had to be completed in the new period; but by the time this long-drawn-out process had been accomplished, we can see how the inactive chamber of the minority was gradually developing into the vigorous chamber of the firmly established young king.

SECTION III

EXPANSION, 1333-1355

In the first two years of Edward III.'s real reign, there was little evidence of any fresh developments of the king's chamber. The fall of Isabella and Mortimer influenced the chamber only by giving fresh impetus to the audit of the arrears of chamber accounts. Now, whatever the motives which inspired the exchequer audit of the chamber, one obvious result flowed from it. The passing in review of the whole chamber system of Edward II.'s reign undoubtedly called the attention of the young king to the possibilities of the chamber as an instrument of his individual authority. It is certain that a revival of the chamber followed closely upon the majority of Edward III., that this revival was based almost entirely upon the lines of development indicated by the chamber of Edward II., and that it had the same effect of bringing the chamber into greater prominence as the rival of the exchequer.

The revival can be dated from the beginning of 1333. In that year there began the first chamber accounts which have survived since the fall of the Despensers. Before long, the chamber fiercely repudiated liability for accounting to any authority save the king. Within a few weeks of the reassertion of that doctrine, the characteristic feature of the chamber of the previous reign reappeared in the renewal of the reservation of certain royal lands for the service of the chamber. All this can hardly represent mere coincidence, since from that time onwards we can trace a constant succession of chamber officers and a continual multiplication of their numbers, functions and importance. For the management of the chamber lands special types of chamber officers, such as had existed under Edward II., were reintroduced.

Though the chamber remained a formal unity, there was, inevitably, a certain amount of distinction drawn between the officers attached to the personal service of the chamber in the court and the officers whose main business was the control of a

considerable estate, scattered all over England. Yet all were ministers of a common master, and all were working in the same department of the general administrative service of the crown. The tendency to differentiation became most acute when the needs of the landed estate produced a separate secretariat, with a special seal—the griffin seal—set apart for the business of the chamber lands, and standing in strong contrast to the secret seal, under which chamber business was normally transacted. Even so, there was still only one chamber. Nor could the exigencies of a great war break up the chamber into self-contained units. But it sharpened tendencies already expressing themselves in the years of comparative peace, and divided the chamber into two sections, one to stay at home and the other to follow the king abroad on his campaigns. Before long, the chamber began to trench on the spheres of exchequer, chancery, privy seal and wardrobe. It was the best expression of Edward III.'s prerogative claims in the early years of the great war.

At first the pace of these developments was slow. More rapid progress followed in 1335, after the assumption of the chief post in the chamber by the masterful personality of William Kilsby. Then, in 1337–38, the outbreak of the French war precipitated a movement which, perhaps, had been initiated by the needs of the Scotch war. There was, as under Edward II., the promise of almost indefinite extension, but for some reason the opportunities for further development were not fully utilised. Whenever the prerogative was strong, the movement advanced with increasing momentum, but it languished when financial considerations made the king dependent on baronial and parliamentary support. Finally the chamber became less conspicuous, and lost some of its political significance with the reorganisation of its finances in 1355–56.

Between 1327 and 1333 no lands were reserved for the chamber. When, on December 1, 1330, queen Isabella surrendered all her lands to her son,¹ many former chamber manors, such as Burstwick, came back to the king. Had Edward already formed

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1330–34, p. 48; *C.F.R.* iv. 204. Her new provision was to be £3000 a year from the exchequer, soon commuted to an equivalent value in land; *Foedera*, ii. 835. I can find no old chamber manors in these fresh grants, though all were of estates in her hands before Dec. 1.

the intention of reviving the chamber estate, this opportunity was too good to have been lost. But all the resumed lands were entrusted to keepers answerable at the exchequer.¹ Among these was Burstwick, whose old keeper, John Thwait, received back its stewardship and answered at the exchequer for its issues until his death.² His successor, Thomas Sinningthwait, appointed on the same terms, also answered at the exchequer at first,³ but on February 6, 1333, a regrant of Burstwick to Sinningthwait directed him to answer for the issues thereof to the king in his chamber as from December 10, 1332, a period subsequently pushed back to Michaelmas.⁴ This is the earliest instance I have come across of the reintroduction of reservation of lands for chamber use, and it is important because Burstwick was the largest area that had ever been put permanently into the hands of the chamber. It afforded a good start to the revived chamber estate.

The exchequer was bitterly hostile to this revival, and represented the withdrawal of Burstwick from its jurisdiction. Only after repeated royal injunctions did it desist from demanding of Sinningthwait that he should continue to account before it.⁵ If Edward anticipated that chamber audit would secure him a larger return, he was soon disappointed. Sinningthwait had been expected to pay 1000 marks a year as its rent, but he forwarded to

¹ *C.F.R.* iv. 201-2, 213-215, 237-258, give the new custodies. Roger Gildesburgh, king's clerk, was, on Jan. 12, appointed chief steward and surveyor of the lands Isabella had surrendered in December; *ib.* p. 223. Among the former chamber lands now depending on the exchequer were Isleworth, Tickhill, Glatton and Holme.

² *Ib.* iv. p. 201. The writ is dated Dec. 3, 1330. Thwait's accounts from 4-6 Edw. III. are in *Pipe*, 176/49, 5 Edw. III., and *ib.* 177/48, 6 Edw. III. They go on until his death on Mar. 2, 1332. His widow Catherine tendered his last account.

³ *Ib.* iv. 305; *Pipe*, 6 Edw. III. 177/49. Sinningthwait's account began on Mar. 2, 1332, "ita quod de exitibus ex tunc provenientibus regi respondeat ad scaccarium regis." *C.F.R.* iv. 313 shows that the coroner of Holderness, appointed on May 6, 1332, paid his rent for the office to the exchequer, but that on June 15 (*ib.* p. 316) he was to render his rent to the bailiff of Burstwick. This was a step towards a self-sufficing jurisdiction.

⁴ The commitment of Burstwick to Sinningthwait ran from Dec. 10, 1332, "so that he answer in the chamber for the issues thereof"; *ib.* iv. 349. But compare *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 160. A feature of the franchise was a special manor called Bondburstwick, where the tenants were bondsmen. See later, p. 297, n. 2.

⁵ On Oct. 22, 1333, the king still found it necessary to order the exchequer to supersede its demands on Sinningthwait for his accounts; *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 160.

the chamber for the first year of his stewardship £125 only. Neither was his successor better able to gratify the king.¹

Burstwick was not for long the only chamber estate. Direct relations between the crown and Burstwick had begun when Burstwick came to Edward I. as part of the inheritance of Isabella of Fors. This great lady had also been the "lady of the Isle of Wight," and her estates there had fallen to the crown after her surrender of the Redvers inheritance in 1293.² The centre of the new royal demesne was the castle of Carisbrooke with various manors, townships and jurisdictions, which were sometimes called the honour of Carisbrooke and sometimes the lordship of the Isle of Wight. This region was historically so closely associated with Burstwick and Holderness that it is strange that, except for the brief period when, like Burstwick, it was held by Gaveston, Edward II. had allowed it to remain under the control of the exchequer. Probably the reason for this was that the island had been granted in 1317 to the king's eldest son, the future Edward III.³ Naturally, when Edward III. became effective king, the estate which had been his from childhood seemed particularly appropriate for chamber control. It is interesting that the last of the keepers, John Langford, knight, was, so late as December 1334, appointed keeper of Carisbrooke and the king's lands in the Isle of Wight, "so that he answer at the exchequer for the revenue thereof."⁴ Ten months later

¹ A curious document found in *Exch. of Receipt, Warrants for Issue*, 3/17, throws so much light on the tentative process by which chamber reservation was restored and on the uncertainties of the officials about it, that it is worth transcribing. The date is Mar. 25, 1334. The address is lost, but it seems unlikely that it can be addressed to the treasurer and chamberlains of the exchequer. It is much more probable that the king sent it to some chamber officer. Many miscellaneous documents, besides the proper "warrants for issue," are contained in these bundles. It runs: "Saluz et bon amitie. Il vous souient bien coment le manoir de Brusewyk nous estoit assignez a nostre chambre por mil marz par an, et nauons uncore resceu des rentes ne de toutes maneres des issues du dit manoir del an passez forsque sys vyntz et cynk liures. Issint qe ariere nous sont uncore de cel an du dit assignement seizant et une liures, treize soldz et quatre deniers, du temps qe Thomas de Synyngtwayt estoit nostre bailiff illoeqs. Por quai vous mandoms qe vous facez ordener coment qe nous pooms hastiement estre seruiz en nostre chambre des deniers qi nous sont duz en nostre dit manoir du temps qe le dit Thomas estoit ensi nostre bailiff, et ce qe vous ferrez en cestes busoignes nous remander hastiement par le portur de cestes et par vos lettres, et aussint que les terres nous sont nouelment assignez pur nostre chambre et de quel lieu et de quele value. Ce ne sesse. Done sous nostre secre seal a Rokyngham, le xxv jour de Mars, lan de nostre regne oytisme."

² *R.B.E.* iii. 1015-23.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1313-18, p. 510.

⁴ *C.F.R.* iv. 426.

another writ, dated October 13, 1335, ordered Langford to answer in the chamber for the issues of Carisbrooke castle and the king's lands in Wight.¹ By this act the Isle of Wight became the southern counterpart of Holderness.

Other more scattered lands were now gradually assigned to the chamber, but, apart from Holderness and Wight, the list of permanently reserved lands never became a long one. Many of the characteristic chamber lands of Edward II. were not brought back to its jurisdiction. The chief reason was that many of them were no longer under the king's personal control. Queen Philippa, for instance, held Isleworth and Langley Marsh,² and the king's brother, John of Eltham, earl of Cornwall, held Byfleet and Eye.³ Burstwick was, of course, the great exception to this rule, and some other old chamber manors reverted from time to time to chamber control. Among them were Chiltern Langley, Herts., which seems to have been reserved to the chamber from Michaelmas 1336, although actually Isabella did not surrender it to the king until early in 1344.⁴ Another was Easthampstead, Berks., which accounted to the chamber from 1338 almost by accident, because a keeper for a term of years had continued to enjoy its profits after the expiration of the period, and the king, by way of punishment, imposed upon him the stricter account before the chamber. When the negligent keeper was removed in 1343, Easthampstead formally became a chamber manor.⁵

¹ *C.F.R.* iv. 461.

² *C.C.R.*, 1340-43, pp. 48, 68.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 184. This was a grant of Oct. 14, 1331.

⁴ There is on *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 9, a mandate of Feb. 14, 1346, to the exchequer not to intermeddle with Langley, "which the king had reserved since Michaelmas in his tenth year." Langley was in the hands of queen Isabella from 1331 to 1344; *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 195; *ib.*, 1343-45, p. 263. Isabella's surrender was sometime before or on May 26, 1344, and on June 20 Edward reserved it to his chamber; *ib.* p. 271. It was, then, in 18 Edw. III., not 10 Edw. III., that reservation first became practical politics. At the best the earlier date can only express an intention. The confused way in which writs were enrolled in patent, close and fine rolls makes a search for such a point tedious, even with the help of the calendars and their indexes.

⁵ Easthampstead had been granted, on Mar. 18, 1334, to Thomas Foxley for four years, at a rent payable in the exchequer. Foxley continued his stewardship without warrant until July 1, 1343, when the king ordered him to account in the chamber for the years after his grant had lapsed; *C.C.R.*, 1343-46, p. 157. On the same day a new grant of it was made to Henry Greystock and the estate formally reserved to the chamber; *C.F.R.* v. 334. Yet the exchequer continued to interfere, for, on July 1, 1347, the mandate not to intermeddle was repeated; *M.R.K.R.* 123, breu. dir. bar., 21 Edw. III. Trin. t.

Even new chamber manors came to its care somewhat by hap-hazard, as for instance Somerton castle, Lincs. John Crabbe had been appointed keeper of this to answer at the exchequer, but from March 30, 1335, his account was transferred to the chamber for so long a time as he held that office.¹ Crabbe's custody lasted until 1352, so that Somerton belonged to the chamber for the greater part of the period we are now discussing.²

The list of chamber lands could easily be extended, but it would be unprofitable to do so since they are insignificant in extent. The quasi-permanent chamber lands of Edward III., held *ut de jure suo proprio*,³ were hardly more extensive than those of Edward II. Many of the estates put under the jurisdiction of the chamber in the years of most lavish reservation, between 1335 and 1337, were intended to be, and actually were, only temporarily in chamber custody. The sphere of chamber influence became gradually enlarged by the reservation to it of forfeitures, escheats and estates of crown wards, all of which, though they might become permanent parts of the crown domain, were normally regranted, either to a representative of the last holder, or to some favourite of the king. There were always a large number of such estates under the chamber control at a particular time, but the actual lands were continually changing.

We have seen that in one period of the reign of Edward II. it was customary to reserve to the chamber forfeited lands of rebels and contrarians. Under Edward III., the custom sprang up again, until it became almost a matter of course that lands forfeited for treason should be administered by the chamber. The first great instance of such reversion to former usage came with the arrangements made for the disposal of the lands of John Molyns, to which reference has already been made.⁴

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 384, an order to exchequer not to distrain the keeper, John Crabbe, to account there, as the king, though he had granted it to Crabbe to answer at the exchequer, now wished him to account at the chamber so long as he held that custody.

² *C.F.R.* vi. 321, commission of Feb. 20, 1352, to chamber officers to inquire as to the estate of Crabbe at the time of his death.

³ I borrow this phrase from Henry Greystock's "*certificacio de compotis nondum redditis*" of 1356. Greystock further distinguished between the lands held "*racione forisfacture*," or "*racione minoris etatis*," or "*ex dimissione*" of such and such person; *E.A.* 392/15.

⁴ See above, iii. 123.

Molyns' record as a chamber officer gave particular point to his lands being administered by the chamber, for they were thus confided to the care of the department which he had betrayed. One result of this, which deserves mention here, was that Henley in Surrey became, as under Edward II., a chamber manor.¹ In the same way, when Adam Peshale, sometime sheriff of Shropshire and Staffordshire, forfeited his estates for rebellion, his lands were, in 1345, put under chamber direction.² Even Ireland was not exempt from chamber control, for in 1346 the lands of the earl of Desmond, taken into the king's hands by reason of his rebellion, were reserved to the chamber.³ Another forfeiture of note which enriched the chamber was that of the disgraced chief justice, Sir William Thorp, whose lands went to the chamber in 1351.⁴ An inconspicuous example of reservation is that of the forfeited lands of a Lincolnshire malefactor who had been hanged.⁵ In 1349, and again in 1353, it was laid down as settled policy that the king reserved to his chamber lands that came to him by way of forfeiture or escheat.⁶

On October 15, 1349, Edward announced that he reserved to his chamber all lands which had come, or should come, into his hands as escheats,⁷ thereby constituting escheats as a third category of chamber lands. Forfeitures and escheats were so nearly akin that the same treatment for both was only natural. Both alike were now taken away from exchequer control. This involved trespassing on the special functions of the escheators, who had always been in a sense exchequer officers. It was another blow struck by the chamber against the exchequer.

¹ The Molyns forfeiture raises many curious questions. Molyns seems habitually to have used his position to appropriate for himself a considerable proportion of chamber lands, such as the "fee of Chokes and Pinkney," Northants, granted to him on J. de Fiennes' forfeiture; *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 45. These, on his forfeiture, went to the chamber. Henley, Surrey, for two years a chamber manor under Edward II., had passed from the crown and was acquired by Molyns from the earl of Huntingdon; *ib.*, 1343-46, p. 192. A list of Molyns' lands, kept by the chamber, is in *ib.* pp. 550-551, recording the dates in 1345 when they were restored.

² *C.F.R.* v. 449, 454, 455; *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 107. The lands were restored to his son in 1352; *ib.* p. 409. ³ *C.F.R.* v. 471. ⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, pp. 145, 294.

⁵ *E.A.* 392/18. "Racione forisfacture Anketini de Houby, nuper suspensi in Northwitham in comitatu Lincolnie."

⁶ *C.F.R.* vi. 354; *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 145. The former reference is a mandate to all escheators to certify all such lands to the "king's chamber at Westminster."

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 405.

A fourth class of chamber lands consisted of estates, normally held in chief, but temporarily in the hands of the crown by reason of the nonage, disability or incapacity of their tenants. Crown wards were, of course, always under the king's supervision. Some of them lived in the king's household with wages, liveries and other necessities according to their rank. These also helped the squires of the chamber in the performance of their domestic duties, and were therefore to some extent members of the chamber staff of the court. It was not, however, until Edward III.'s reign that the chamber systematically took charge of wards' lands. Such wardships, though naturally only temporary, were numerous, the more so as the lands of idiots, lunatics and the like,¹ holding in chief, came into that category. A large proportion of the long lists of lands reserved to the chamber at any given date between 1332 and 1348 consists of wardships of this class.² After 1348 the chamber had to share the custody of such lands with the wardrobe, and, as time went on, its operations were considerably curtailed.

A good example of temporary chamber custody is that of the lands of Roger Mortimer,³ grandson of the first earl of March. Not only had he a long minority, but his grandfather's acts involved him in some suspicion, and the earldom was only tardily revived in his favour in 1355. His inheritance was necessarily kept by royal agents who at first accounted at the exchequer, and the slow process of the transference of their accountability to

¹ For instance, "Nicholas of Glamorgan an idiot"; *C.F.R.* v. 333, 334. Cf. *ib.* p. 338, where another idiot's lands were accountable at the exchequer.

² See, for instance, the list in *C.C.R.*, 1343-46, pp. 303-304, of the lands reserved to the chamber in 1344 with which the exchequer was not further to intermeddle. Besides the great Holderness and Wight estates, it includes Corsham, Wilts., an outlying Redvers manor, reserved in 1335 (*C.F.R.* iv. 431); the manor of Kirkby Kendal and its members in Westmorland; the manor of Moorholm with Carnforth and Lindeth, Westmorland; a moiety of the manor of Wyresdale and the town of Ulverston, Lancs.; Thornton in Lonsdale, Yorks.; and the Mortimer lands mentioned later on p. 246, n. 5. There were also Brompton manor, Somerset; Easthampstead, Berks; and the forfeited lands of John Molyns and Robert of Guines, a sub-tenant of the earl of Lancaster; *ib.*, 1333-37, pp. 219, 225.

³ Among other lands under ward, specially mentioned as reserved to the chamber, are included those of the heirs of Hugh de Plecy (*C.C.R.*, 1337-39, p. 64); Robert Herries (*C.P.R.*, 1343-45, p. 479); William de Coucy (*ib.*, 1345-48, p. 76); John Barnack (*C.C.R.*, 1346-49, pp. 34, 93); Geoffrey of Cornwall (*ib.* pp. 106, 437); William of St. Quentin (*ib.*, 1349-54, p. 320); William Ros of Helmsley; John de St. Philibert and J. de Gatecomb (*E.A.* 392/18).

the chamber is typical of the course of chamber history. Thus on February 27, 1334, Hugh Tyrrell, king's yeoman, was given the custody of Radnor castle, Gwrthrennion and Kerry, for which he was to answer at the exchequer.¹ On the same day, however, a second writ ordered Tyrrell to hold these estates, along with Pembridge in Herefordshire "so that he answer in the chamber for the issues thereof."² Another writ of the same date gave him custody of Knighton and Presteign to answer at the exchequer,³ but on April 4, 1335, the king declared his will that Knighton and Presteign should also be answered for in the chamber from the beginning of his office.⁴ Later, in 1344, when Roger received personal custody of some of his lands, even before he came of age, he was himself required to pay for them £250 a year as rent in the chamber until his majority.⁵

A fifth element of the chamber estate was introduced by the reservation of certain ecclesiastical lands. The most important of these were the estates and benefices held by alien enemies. The French war was indirectly responsible for this, for it gave the king a golden opportunity to extend, without offence or scandal, the system of chamber reservation to lands of the church. As under Edward I. and Edward II., it was considered undesirable that French monks, established in priories of their own on English soil, should raise revenues which might be smuggled into France to increase the Valois usurper's power of resisting king Edward's claim to his mother's "inheritance." Accordingly, on July 23, 1337, orders were issued for the alien priories to be taken into the king's hands.

Normally, the custody of such lands would be assigned to keepers responsible to the exchequer, though there were important exceptions to this rule. In this case it was assumed from the beginning that in chamber districts the chamber should be the responsible authority, and possibly even a wider measure of chamber control was contemplated. Before the general order was issued, the king's intention was made clear by a direction to the exchequer, dated July 1, not to depute under its seal any man to take into the king's hands any such

¹ *C.F.R.* iv. 389.

² *Ib.* p. 400.

³ *Ib.* iv. 400.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 440.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1341-43, pp. 341-342; compare *ib.*, 1343-46, p. 305. The grant was of Radnor, Gwrthrennion, Presteign, Knighton and Norton.

property in the parts of Holderness, because the king had already appointed John Molyns and others for this purpose "so that answer be made to the king for the issues of the said lands and goods."¹ This vague phrase, coupled with the name of a prominent chamber knight, shows that Edward had already resolved that the alien priory of Burstall in Holderness,² should, like Burstwick itself, be accounted for in the king's chamber. When, on July 27, the alien priories were assigned to keepers appointed by the crown, Burstall priory, and in addition the priories of St. Helen's, Appledurcombe and Carisbrooke in the Isle of Wight, were directly reserved to the chamber.³ These latter were all in the southern possessions of the old house of Albemarle, so that the two chamber districts saw their religious houses specially reserved for chamber control.

Further than this Edward III. did not go in 1337, but already an ambiguity in the appointment of the other keepers of the alien priories suggests that he had it in his mind to retain the right of reserving them all to the chamber. The usual formula now was that the keepers were to "account at the exchequer or elsewhere at the king's order." The same phrase was used in another long list of churches held by alien parsons and of manors held by alien lords, whose keepers or farmers were similarly required to account in the exchequer or elsewhere.⁴ But although this power was taken, it was seldom exercised, even in connection with alien priories, and otherwise never. Most of the alien houses were

¹ *C.F.R.* v. 25.

² This priory, now engulfed in the sea, but a considerable house, whose keeper paid 400 marks a year as rent, was in the parish of Skeffling. The prior held, with other Holderness churches, the chapel of Burstwick, which was included in Skeffling parish, though many miles away. The priory depended on the abbey of Aumale in Normandy, the chief foundation of the house of Aumale or Albemarle, which acquired the lordship of Holderness from the Conqueror.

³ *Ib.* pp. 28-33 gives a list of all houses and the property so seized and of the keepers appointed. The "warranty" for the Appledurcombe writ was "by king and council and by bill of John de Molyns," so that Molyns was the responsible chamber agent in Wight as in Holderness. The rents were: Burstall 400 marks; St. Helens £13:6:8; Appledurcombe £63:13:4; and Carisbrooke £113:6:8. No mainpernors were needed to vouch the solvency of any of these chamber priories save Carisbrooke. Clearly the king had a sufficiently tight hold of his agents in chamber manors. The priory of St. Cross in Wight, worth £10 a year, was added to the chamber priories before February 1343; *ib.* p. 316. It is omitted from the long list already quoted.

⁴ *Ib.* pp. 33-37.

accountable at the exchequer, and when new keepers—normally loyal monks of the house affected—were appointed, they were often directed to account at the exchequer only.¹ A striking instance is the order of February 20, 1340, that certain alien priories, which had escaped earlier seizure, were to account at the exchequer.²

There was the same exception as regards benefices held by alien enemies in chamber districts. These were made accountable at the chamber and not at the exchequer. Thus the profits of the rectory of Whippingham in Wight, which had a French parson, were accounted for in the chamber.³ Some extra-cameral districts were dealt with similarly. Thus, before October 1348, the king had reserved to his chamber certain lands, rents and advowsons "in Jersey, Guernsey and other islands contiguous to England."⁴ The Channel Islands were not only French in speech but were connected with the Norman mainland by many ties of family and feudal, economic and ecclesiastical obligation. As part of the diocese of Coutances, it was natural for their bishop to appoint Frenchmen to the cure of French souls. So late as 1350 the mischief was still there, and the only remedy was an order to the keeper of the islands to keep out alien clergy, whether appointed at Coutances or Avignon, and farm their benefices, paying over any profits, after due provision for divine service, to the receiver of the king's chamber.⁵ Other alien religious sought permission to remain in possession of their property by paying fines into the chamber. For instance, the abbot of Cluni, with that object, made with the king a fine of £200, the payment of which was rateably divided between various Cluniac priories in England.⁶ Similarly the prior of Ware, an alien, purchased the custody of the temporalities of his priory for the duration of the war, and for an extra 100 marks paid to the chamber obtained all advow-

¹ The new keeper of Llangennith, South Wales, was instructed to that effect; *ib.* p. 123, but compare *ib.* pp. 32 and 127. Some houses were so directed even in 1337, for instance, Derby priory; *ib.* p. 32. Later instances of accounting "at exchequer or elsewhere" are on *ib.* pp. 95, 96, 124, 127, 141, 143.

² *C.F.R.* v. 158.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1343-46, p. 303.

⁴ *Ib.*, 1349-54, p. 193.

⁵ *C.F.R.*, 1346-49, pp. 281, 565; *ib.* vi. 213-214. The same provision was applied to Channel Islanders having traffic with the king's enemies and to king's enemies inheriting property there.

⁶ *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 306. The priories paid their quota into the exchequer, but the exchequer was directed to pay this over to the receiver of the chamber.

sons of the dependent churches for the same time.¹ The church of Mapledurham, Oxfordshire, appropriated to the abbey of Clair-Ruissel, Seine-Inférieure, was an example of a church assigned to the chamber, though not in a place reserved to it.²

The chamber control of certain alien priories, and the analogous control of wards, doubtless suggested an extension of chamber jurisdiction to the temporalities of vacant benefices. Yet the hesitation which characterised the dealings with alien priories is paralleled by the caution with which the chamber was given power over the revenue of such temporalities. A notable instance of this is found in the vicissitudes of the temporalities of the see of York after archbishop Melton's death in 1340. At first, treasurer Zouch was made keeper and instructed to account at the exchequer, that is, to himself. In a few days he was superseded by three keepers who, three months later, were ordered to account at the chamber. This order needed a certain amount of iteration before it became effective,³ and reservation to the chamber soon became unattractive or unprofitable, even the reservation of alien priories. Thus, when, on March 3, 1340, Thomas Cross, keeper of the great wardrobe, was compensated for his losses in the king's service, "especially beyond seas," by the custody of several alien priory estates, he was ordered to render his accounts for them "at the exchequer or elsewhere."⁴ On bishop Burghersh's death, the temporalities of the see of Lincoln were entrusted to keepers who were to answer exclusively to the exchequer.⁵ Yet, as late as 1345, the exchequer was ordered not to intermeddle with the farm for the vacant abbey of

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 51.

² *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 437.

³ The stages were: (a) appointment of Zouch, April 7, 1340; *C.F.R.* v. 168; (b) appointment of three keepers in his place, April 14; *ib.* p. 170, one of whom, Buckland, was on the same day superseded because occupied with chamber business; *ib.* p. 171; (c) the same commission and the same surveyor ordered to account at the chamber; *ib.* p. 183; (d) a second appointment of the same, to account at chamber, dated Sluys, July 6, with a note, "be it remembered that this commission was delivered in chancery Mar. 6, 1341"; *ib.* p. 202; (e) a record that two of the commissioners had accounted before Buckland in the chamber from April 5, 1340, to Sept. 29, 1341; *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 398; (f) their formal acquittance from the exchequer on April 21, 1345; *ib.*, 1343-45, p. 453. For the disputed election which prolonged their custody, see above, iii. 116-118. For Buckland and his colleagues, see later, pp. 267-270.

⁴ *C.F.R.* v. 167. Compare for other instances *ib.* pp. 168, 194; but *ib.* p. 189 is another case of accounting "at the exchequer or elsewhere."

⁵ *Ib.* v. 198. This was on Dec. 15, 1340.

Evesham which was to be paid into the chamber.¹ Sometimes part of a vacant church's temporalities were assigned to the chamber, while the keepers of the rest accounted at the exchequer. For instance, while the mass of the great temporalities of Durham were, on Richard of Bury's death in 1345, assigned to the Bartolommei of Lucca, the king kept from them the manor of Howden, which he reserved to the chamber.² Such custodies were even more temporary than wardships, though Edward III. had little scruple in retaining them as long as he could.

There are other indications of a stiffening up of chamber reservation. The vague direction given to Edington and Ellerker, receivers of the ninth in 1340, to answer for that subsidy "to the king," may disguise an unconfessed striving towards chamber control which was soon abandoned.³

The same fortune befell the tentative efforts to increase chamber authority beyond the sea, where for a time the chamber bade fair to become one of the strongest links between the home and foreign administrations of the crown. Yet even the cautious extension of chamber jurisdiction over lay estates in the Channel Islands was not maintained, and the petitions of the governor for further powers in that direction were coldly received, though he was authorised to account at the chamber for the rent charged for each fisherman's boat.⁴ The largest continental development of chamber control came when enterprising captains farmed Breton and Norman castles and estates by reason of large farms paid into the chamber.⁵ As this was in 1360, when

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1343-46, p. 507.

² *C.P.R.*, 1343-45, p. 457. The proximity of Holderness doubtless suggested this exception. The escheator of Holderness answered in the chamber for Howdenshire; *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 14. In the same way William de la Pole's rights—old and new—in Holderness were gradually bought up by the crown. See especially *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 97, and *ib.*, 1354-60, pp. 188, 194, 196. By 1339 Pole was granted Bond Burstwick, and on June 8 other members of Burstwick for 10 years; *C.F.R.* iv. 83; and for a short time, as pledge for a loan, the manor of Burstwick itself; *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 392.

³ *C.F.R.* v. 178. But *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 120, and *C.C.R.*, 1341-43, p. 243, show that Edington and Ellerker were soon accounting at the exchequer. Yet Edington's title of "king's receiver in the Tower of London" brought him into line with the "king's receiver of the chamber," who at that time was also operating in the chamber, or privy wardrobe, of the Tower. See later, pp. 258-260.

⁴ *C.F.R.* v. 214.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 195. The following entries on the patent roll of 35 Edw. III. are not uncharacteristic: (a) "Sciatis quod recepimus in cameram nostram de dilecto et fideli nostro, Thoma Fog, octingentas libras in partem

the chamber landed estate had become a thing of the past, it was natural that such foreign farms were never spoken of as lands reserved to the chamber. Moneys, especially when arising from chamber estates, were reserved to the chamber, as when in 1342 the exchequer was ordered to cause all debts to William de la Pole to be seized and assigned for the expenses of the chamber. Such sums were to be delivered by the exchequer to the receiver of the chamber.¹

The revival of the system of reserving lands to the chamber involved some reconstitution of chamber organisation. The traditional officers of the chamber had thrown upon them further important duties, but since the management of the chamber lands could only be subsidiary to their main task, it was necessary, as it had been under Edward II., to establish a new staff. Its chief function was the administration of the estate, though it was also called upon, as time went on, to do some of the more general chamber work. It is difficult to discover any general principles underlying the apparent confusion of the chamber staffs, old and new, though in attempting to describe the two I shall try to separate them as far as is possible. Yet we must never forget that the chamber was and remained a single organisation. When the king reserved lands for the service of his chamber, all that he wished to do was to provide the chamber with an adequate revenue, and in assigning it a landed estate for this purpose he did just the same as when he endowed a new earl, or a kinsman growing up to manhood, with lands sufficient to support him in the dignity natural to his station. This partly explains why the new officers did not confine their attention to the chamber estate, but often lent a hand with a number of tasks not directly concerning them. Such distractions were the more imperative whenever the chief officers of the chamber followed Edward

solucionis tercię partis areste nobis competentis de redempcionibus et reuencionibus castrorum que idem Thomas nuper nomine nostro in partibus Normannie et alibi in partibus Francie tenuit”; *Patent Roll* 264, pt. iii. m. 13, Nov. 26, 1361; *C.P.R.*, 1361-64, p. 126. (b) Acknowledgment of receipt by the king in his chamber of 5333 “scutos aureos de Philippe” from Robert de Eues, being “tercia parte areste nobis per ipsum Robertum de redempcionibus que ad castrum de Seintwath’ in Normannia pertinebant”; *ib.* pt. iii. m. 15, Dec. 2, 1361; *C.P.R.*, 1361-64, p. 122.

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1341-43, p. 656. No doubt Pole’s connection with Holderness was a special reason for this course.

to the continent. While on the one hand that division of the chamber into two parts still further differentiated in practice, if not in theory, the various aspects of chamber activity, on the other hand it tended to bring together the chamber estate officers and the other officers of the chamber left behind in England. These latter, like the former, followed the example of all departments relieved from the obligation of itinerating with the court. They settled down in some one definite place. Thus, not only the department for the administration of chamber lands had its home in London or Westminster, but the general receipt of the chamber similarly localised itself. In this we detect a new manifestation of that ancient tendency which, in the twelfth century, had caused the bifurcation of the Norman chamber into a *camera* following the court and a *scaccarium*, normally established at Winchester or Westminster.

No one in the fourteenth century knew, or cared to know, that the exchequer had grown out of the chamber. Yet when the king removed certain functions and certain estates from the supervision of the exchequer and transferred them to his chamber, it was but natural that the methods of the exchequer should suggest appropriate methods to the chamber. The exchequer had its two departments, the exchequer of receipt and the exchequer of account and audit. It had also its local agents, scattered over the country, and going from time to time to Westminster to deposit their receipts and tallies and to tender their accounts. In the same way the chamber had its central and its local staff.

The old chamber had had, at least since Edward II.'s time, its receivers, whose office became more important after the chamber reforms of the early years of Edward III.'s personal rule. The receivers' work was so difficult that the function of receiving in the chamber could be safely entrusted only to clerks, and this habit continued for the whole of the period in which the chamber retained its landed estate. Only when the financial work of the chamber was small and trivial, could a lay knight be allowed to have charge of it. Even in the anti-clerical movement in 1340-41, there remained a clerical receiver and he the soul of the anti-clerical movement. It was not until after the collapse of the chamber estate in 1356, that a lay

receiver became the rule. The chief function of the clerical receiver was the receipt and custody of moneys. The branch of the chamber under his charge was soon called the receipt, and subordinate officers made answer for the issues of their lands at the "receipt of the chamber,"¹ just as those who were responsible to the exchequer went to the receipt of the exchequer.

The difficult process of accounting and auditing required a special authority. Accordingly, side by side with the receivers were the stewards, surveyors, auditors and controllers of the chamber. Under Edward II. the controllers had been sharply differentiated from the others, but under Edward III. they were generally the same persons as the surveyors and stewards. There were also the two secretariats, the old chamber secretariat of the secret seal and the new secretariat of the reserved lands, whose instrument was the griffin seal. Each required clerks to keep the seal, to write for it, and to preserve its archives. There were also the local officers, the keepers or stewards responsible for the control of the several estates. As the larger estates, like Burstwick and the Isle of Wight, became in effect royal franchises, their administration required a considerable staff. This included coroners, escheators and justices, so that for most purposes these estates were cut off from ordinary jurisdiction, and became something like counties in themselves.

The outlying chamber manors were in a different position. Few efforts were made to group them under a single jurisdiction, the chief exception being the attempt to set up chamber escheators, to which we shall have later to refer. But the chamber escheators may perhaps be primarily regarded as members of the group of liaison officers who hovered between the central and local administrators of the chamber. Most conspicuous in that group were the surveyors, who went out from the central office to visit the various estates and examine, report and amend the doings of the local officers. Since chamber activities never developed beyond a certain point, it was natural that, as new duties arose, they should be shared among individuals who were already engaged in chamber work. Even in the larger aggrega-

¹ For instance, the first general escheator of chamber lands, William Berkhamsted, was to "answer for the issues at the receipt of the chamber"; *C.F.R.* vi. 73.

tions the same individuals often held several different offices, and not Burstwick itself had quite the same equipment as a real palatinate. Yet Burstwick and Carisbrooke prepared the way for that special relation between the king and his personal estates which was to become a settled principle of policy with Richard II.

The development of chamber activity under Edward III. went on with increasing momentum between 1330 and 1340. Perhaps it reached its culminating point in, or rather before, the latter year. In 1337 and 1338 the new offices rendered necessary for the administration of the chamber lands were fully established. It was then that the energetic direction of great chamber offices gave an effective support to the crown in its need. The outbreak of the great war and the withdrawal of the king from his realm for long periods threw upon the administration a more difficult task than it had ever had before, and in the consequent emergency measures the chamber was called upon to take a more responsible share in the general system of government. This is well brought out by the Walton ordinances of 1338, which definitely recognised the chamber as an integral part of the administrative machine.¹ Here we see the high-water mark of chamber development. Had the ordinances been fully carried out, the chamber would have attained an even more eminent position than the important one which it actually occupied.

We must now attempt to study in detail the chamber staff for this period, beginning with the ministers who controlled the ancient office, and going on to the men brought in to do new work. In this survey we need not concern ourselves overmuch with that permanent department of the chamber which was, like the king's hall, an "office" of the king's household. It went on along traditional lines and was little affected even by the fluctuations of policy which touched the other branches of its organisation. No doubt the head of the chamber in all its aspects was the king's chamberlain, but not until after the chamber lands had disappeared did the chamberlain begin, as in the days of the younger Despenser, to take an active part in the administrative work of the chamber, and to recover a strong position for himself. Yet, if there is little evidence of the chamberlains'

¹ See for the Walton ordinances, above, iii. 69-79, Appendix, pp. 143-150.

personal intervention in chamber affairs, the increasing prominence of the sub-chamberlains, who were laymen and knights, as active chamber officers, is a distinct feature of the period. The most famous of them was Sir Guy Brian.¹ Meanwhile the French war gave the lay officers concerned with the domestic work of the chamber, knights and esquires, yeomen and servants alike, fresh opportunities for achieving distinction. Indeed among the knights of Edward III.'s chamber were some of the most eminent warriors of the age. Such, for example, were Sir Guy Brian and Sir Walter Manny.² Even the porters of the chamber, who were not gentlemen but servants, attained some notoriety.

For most practical purposes, we may consider that the working head of the chamber was the receiver. That was so in the great days of the chamber in the reign of Edward II., and it became so again with the revival of the chamber in the early thirties. The first receiver of the chamber of Edward III. was the king's clerk, John Fleet. He had already been in office under Edward II., and is better known as the clerk of the privy wardrobe than as a clerk or receiver of the chamber. His accounts between January 25, 1333, and July 31, 1334, are still extant,³ and, as the earliest surviving chamber accounts of the new reign, they are a clear indication of its growing importance. But they deal with trifling amounts, being mainly concerned with arms, armour and other matters that were directly under Fleet's cognisance as clerk of the privy wardrobe. Had they not called themselves chamber accounts, it would have been enough to have dealt with them under the privy wardrobe. As it is, they are of concern here because, as we shall see, the privy wardrobe and the chamber were not yet much differentiated from each other. They are apparently only partial accounts, for it is certain that, though Fleet was described as receiver, he was rather the receiver's deputy or subordinate. Anyhow he was not a receiver in the

¹ *E.A.* 391/15 (21-23 Ed. III.). See the lists of officials in vol. v. For the later history of the sub-chamberlaincy, see below, pp. 338-341.

² *Ib.* 391/15 shows that the knights of the chamber, 1347-49, included John Grey, John Lisle, Walter Manny, Robert Ferrers, Roger Beauchamp, Guy Brian, Richard la Vache. In 1337 Brian was simply king's yeoman; *C.F.R.* v. 7. On Dec. 6, 1339, Brian, king's yeoman, received £40 for life from the exchequer in consideration of his long service and great perils; *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 403. He was abroad with the king from 1338 to 1340.

³ *E.A.* 335/15.

full sense in which his more dignified successors were. These latter only came to the fore on the outbreak of war with France, when they were at once sent abroad with the king. During their absence, Fleet acquired a new importance as deputy for the chief receiver of the chamber.¹ It followed from this that the Tower wardrobe also became the seat of the central office of the chamber in England. Even then, Fleet was obviously not in the same position as the succession of powerful receivers whose history it is our next business to trace. He is mainly significant in the present connection because he remained, for all his long official career, a chief link between the chamber and the privy wardrobe. With his removal the differentiation of the two, though far from being complete, is sufficiently well marked for our purposes. Yet even Fleet's successors at the privy wardrobe at the Tower were still described as chamber clerks and receivers of the chamber. They were the more naturally so described since they were, like Fleet, normally appointed as the deputies in England of the chief chamber officers who followed the king overseas. They formed, then, one line of receivers of the chamber. With them we shall still be concerned for nearly another thirty years, so long, in fact, as the administration of the chamber estate had one home, at least, in the Tower, hard by the privy wardrobe, and so long as the absences of Edward III compelled the appointment of deputies to look after that side of chamber work in England. Our interest in them is, however, only occasional, and we may well leave them to consider the other receivers who concern us more directly.

The new line of receivers can be traced clearly from the beginning, and the years of Fleet's surviving accounts cover the early part of their activity. The first of them was William Trussell of Kibblestone, Staffordshire, king's yeoman, who acted from January 26, 1333, to January 25, 1335.² He was "appointed by the king by word of mouth to receive and administer all moneys pertaining to the chamber." It is curious that a lay receiver should be appointed, and it may be that his early removal was due to the failure of the experiment. However that

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 138; *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, pp. 163-164.

² *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 448. For his accounts, see later, pp. 286-287. He is probably to be distinguished from William Trussell, escheator south of Trent early in the reign.

may be, he was the predecessor of a series of clerical receivers of masterful personality. All of them were high in the king's confidence, and some made the chamber the starting-point of a great career. The quarter of a century covered by them was exactly the heyday of Edward III.'s chamber.

The first person definitely described as Trussell's successor was William Kilsby, king's clerk, who held office from January 25, 1335, to July 6, 1338.¹ We have heard of him already in higher office, for he went from the chamber to keep the privy seal, his career culminating in the anti-clerical revolution of 1340, and his scandalous pursuit of the archbishopric of York.² Completely in the king's confidence, Kilsby found, in the preparations for the great war, an excellent opportunity of showing his resourcefulness and financial skill.

Kilsby's successor, Thomas Hatfield, king's clerk, acted from July 12, 1338, to December 4, 1344.³ A Holderness man by birth, Hatfield was born, so to say, for chamber work. His career also has already been mentioned,⁴ for he too rose to high office, to the privy seal and to the bishopric of Durham. He was appointed as "receiver of certain sums of money to be received for the expedition of certain business of the king so that he render account and answer therefor to the king."⁵ "To the king" here means, as in many similar relations, "to the chamber," and Hatfield interpreted this obligation so strictly that he, as we shall see, refused to account at the exchequer and was backed up by the king in his refusal.⁶ No doubt some of his transactions, when abroad with the king between 1338 and 1340, would hardly bear official scrutiny. We have already remarked that during Kilsby and Hatfield's absence from England their place was supplied by John Fleet, who for that work accounted in the chamber.⁷ This fact still further links up the keeper of the Tower wardrobe, the receiver at the Tower and the itinerant receiver with the court.

¹ *Ib.*, 1340-43, p. 448.

² See above, iii. 84-85, 123-132, 152-163.

³ *Ib.*, 1343-45, pp. 371, 420. His appointment was on June 25, 1338; *C.F.R.* v. 85.

⁴ See above, iii. 87, 116-118, 169.

⁵ *C.F.R.* v. 85.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 254. See also *ib.*, 1343-45, p. 371. The exchequer, the wardrobe, and the auditors of the chamber were notified of this fact.

⁷ *C.O.R.*, 1339-41, pp. 138, 179; *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 256.

The history of the receivership during the next few years presents peculiar difficulties. The only surviving account is Robert Burton's, December 25, 1344, to September 29, 1348.¹ There is, however, a document later in date, giving somewhat contradictory information about Burton and his successors.² It records dated payments made by: Robert Burton, December 25, 1344-October 18, 1347; Robert Mildenhall, June 22, 1346-April 21, 1353; William Rothwell, April 29, 1353-July 24, 1355; Thomas Bramber, December 25, 1347-June 24, 1349; Richard Norwich, June 25, 1349-April 15, 1355.³ With such conflicting evidence, it is impossible to arrive at a definite conclusion. There is, however, no doubt that all the persons named in that list were receivers. Thus, there were two lines of receivers. One, represented by Burton, Bramber and Norwich, was only concerned with the chamber. The other, represented by Mildenhall and Rothwell, combined with chamber work the management of the privy wardrobe of the Tower.⁴ Not only do the periods of service of Burton and Bramber appeared to have overlapped, but the dates given in this document cannot be taken as the limits of Bramber's chamber work. In 1352-3, for example, he represented the chamber before the triers of petitions,⁵ and gave information on which the king based writs, because the writs "concerned the king's chamber."⁶

¹ *E.A.* 391/4, gives particulars; the enrolment is in *Pipe*, 194/44.

² *E.A.* 391/1. Described as "Prestita camere regis," this was one of the large number of documents delivered to the exchequer by Greystock after the reorganisation of the chamber in 1356. The endorsement runs: "Hunc librum continens sexdecim folia liberauit hic H. de Greystok', nuper auditor compotorum camere regis, xv° die Februarii, anno xxxvi° regis Edwardi tercij." It will be seen that this record shews Burton acting between Dec. 25, 1344, to Oct. 18, 1347. *Pipe*, 194/44, gives the dates as Feb. 18, 1345, to April 23, 1349. But *E.A.* 391/4, gives Christmas 1344 to Sept. 29, "anno xxii finiente," which I take here to be 1348. The exchequer year beginning at Michaelmas and the regnal year beginning late in January, involve us moderns in some confusion and perhaps also confused contemporaries. For examples of similar trouble in earlier times, see H. G. Richardson's "The Exchequer Year" in *Royal Hist. Soc. Trans.*, 4th series, viii. 171-190, and ix. 175-176.

³ *E.A.* 391/1. An instance of Norwich acting as receiver so late as Mar. 16, 1355, is in *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 121. He is not called receiver, but simply "Richard of Norwich, clerk." The receiver of the chamber seems sometimes to have been described as treasurer of the king's chamber; *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 257.

⁴ See below, pp. 451-457.

⁵ See below, p. 285.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1350-54, p. 418; compare p. 422.

This association continued until late in 1354, when Bramber became keeper of the privy seal, being the third receiver within sixteen years to be promoted to that office. Mildenhall and Rothwell not only bore the title of receiver and are recorded in the same official lists, but they also did the same work so completely that payments into the chamber were indifferently made to them and to Burton and Bramber.¹ When the chamber was reorganised in 1355-56, the accounts for the chamber work of Mildenhall and Rothwell came under consideration along with the other unsettled chamber accounts.² We cannot, therefore, exclude them from the list of receivers of the chamber, although their sphere was not only the chamber but the privy wardrobe too. Like Fleet, they were stationary at the Tower while their colleagues, the receivers proper, moved about with the king at home and abroad, and their chief concern was with arms and armour, not with the king's personal needs, nor with the chamber manors. We can, then, content ourselves with mention of them here, and refer to the privy wardrobe chapter for further consideration of their position. The explanation of their close association with the chamber seems to be provided by the condition of war then prevailing, when most of the offices were divided into home and foreign departments. Regarded as joint receivers of the chamber, Mildenhall and Rothwell, again like John Fleet, also served as actual deputies of their fellow receivers when these last were either out of the country or busy with other duties.³ We infer that, though the chamber and the privy wardrobe each now had a definite sphere, their duties still over-

¹ *E.A.* 391/1. Cf. *ib.* 391/8, 9, 20. No. 9 is the record of the receipt by Roger Mortimer, "du tresor de nostre chambre de Robert de Mildenhall, adonques nostre receuour," of £100, to be restored to the chamber "at our will," and charged to Roger in the rolls of the king's chamber. Cf. *M.R.K.R.* 127, breu. dir. bar., under Oct. 26, 1350, where a writ describes Mildenhall as "receptor denariorum camere nostre." The writ directs the exchequer to exonerate him from accountability, for he had paid into the chamber a fine of £100, paid by the abbot of Malmesbury, as it was recorded, "in compoto suo in camera nostra reddito," "sicut senescallus et auditores compotorum camere nostre nobis significauerunt." *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 252, describes Mildenhall, under the date Feb. 15, 1347, as "receiver of the moneys of the king's chamber at the Tower of London." *E.A.* 391/8, 11, record that of a fine of 2000 marks, the prior and convent of Winchester Cathedral paid 1000 mm. to Burton, 500 mm. to Mildenhall and were forgiven the rest.

² See below, pp. 306-307, where the audit of such accounts is discussed.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, pp. 161, 176, 235, for example.

lapped so much that a joint receivership, especially in wartime, was the best way out of the situation. If this surmise is right, then the facts are the more interesting since the chamber had now left the Tower and taken up headquarters at Westminster.¹ Yet, during the years of greater chamber activity, even this duplication of receivers does not seem to have made them any more accessible.

It is not impossible that the strong series of clerical receivers ended with no less a personage than William of Wykeham, described in 1361 as clerk of the chamber.² A clerk of the chamber need not be receiver, but receivers, except the occasional laymen, were necessarily clerks of the chamber. Indeed, the receivers were more often referred to as clerks of the chamber than by their official title. However, from Wykeham's time on, the identity of clerk and receiver ceases, and we shall see that the later receivers of Edward III. were laymen, like the earliest of the receivers of the reign.

We have said enough to show how the receivership became a prominent office. Even when there were still at least two clerks called receivers, there gradually arose a receiver who might well have been called the chief receiver. The multiplication of financial offices in the service of the crown, however, prevented his attaining the overwhelming position of the "general receiver" of the subordinate royal and baronial households of the period. In all of these the general receiver stands out as the chief financial and accounting officer. This was so with the households of the two queens as well as with those of the prince of Wales and the other members of the royal family. It was equally so with the great baronial households, where the chief authority was with the receiver, it may be, of the earl, afterwards duke, of Lancaster, or the lady Elizabeth of Clare, whose accounts we still have. The same generalisation applies to many similar receivers, whose accounts have not been preserved, but where sufficient evidence remains to testify clearly to the importance of the receiver. Here again we must remember that the special idea suggested in all countries by the chamber was

¹ Devon, p. 164, errs in calling Rothwell in 1356 "keeper of the chamber in the Tower." The "camb." of the roll is wrongly translated as "chamber." It means "cambium," the exchange of the Tower, which Rothwell also kept; cf. above, iii. 179, n. 2, where "camere" of *I.R.* 373 may be an error for "cambii."

² See below, 262.

something financial, more specifically a centralised office of household finance, unifying and dominating the local and occasional offices of receipt.

The older organisation of the chamber centred round the receiver. His general superintendence of the department, in addition to his special function, is well illustrated by his relations with the secretarial aspect of the chamber and its instrument, the secret seal. In stressing the financial importance of the chamber, we must not forget the administrative and secretarial sides of its activity. It was natural that, of the crowd of chamber clerks who assisted the receivers, some should largely specialise in these branches of chamber work. We know that from Edward II.'s time onwards there was a chamber secretariat of the secret seal. Yet we are left almost entirely in the dark as to its personnel and as to the custody of its seal. The analogy of the wardrobe seal of an earlier generation, when the controller of the wardrobe kept the privy seal, suggests that there was, at first, no special keeper of the secret seal, but that its custody was simply one of the duties of some clerk of the office. By the days of Edward III. we have definite evidence which points to the receiver himself being also keeper of the seal. Thus, a papal letter of 1344 describes Thomas Hatfield, then receiver, as "the king's councillor and keeper of his secret seal" and also as the "king's secretary."¹ Although keepers of the privy seal were still usually called secretaries at Avignon,² we know that the privy seal was at this time in other hands. Nor must too much stress be laid on the use of the word "secretary," as this term was also commonly used in its original sense of confidant. Yet it is worth recalling that, after Hatfield's time, it became customary to describe the receiver of the chamber as *secretarius domini regis*.³

English records confirm, to some extent, the phrasing of the papal chancery. In the Walton ordinances of 1338, a clerk of the chamber was associated with the keeper of the privy seal as the

¹ *C. Pap. Reg. Let.* iii. 11, 12.

² Wykeham is the last keeper of the privy seal called secretary by the clerks of the curia. He ceased to keep the privy seal in 1367. See later, vol. v. ch. xvi.

³ For instance, Kilsby is so called in *I.R.* No. 282, Easter 9 Edw. III.; Bramber in 1345 (*C. Pap. Reg. Pet.* i. 101); Norwich in 1355 (*ib.* p. 281); and Wykeham in 1361 (*ib.* pp. 173, 380). Of course there were other "secretarii" as well.

only official member upon the committee of audit, and a "certain clerk of the chamber" was appointed to "control" the warrants for the great seal.¹ The terms of the ordinance are highly ambiguous, but it is not unlikely that the emphasis laid on chamber clerks, in a scheme mainly devised for the control of chancery and exchequer, is evidence that, already in 1338, the clerk of the chamber was keeper of the secret seal, which both directly and indirectly might be a source of "chancery warrants." This is the more probable since Hatfield, to whom the papal chancery attributed such keepership, had been appointed only a few days before the ordinances were drafted, and began to account on the very day they were sealed at Walton.

The title of clerk of the secret seal is, of course, equivalent to keeper. The application of it to Hatfield makes it certain that, at least from this time, the custody of the secret seal was an incident of the duties of the receiver of the chamber. As a matter of fact, with the exception of Richard Burton, described as clerk of the king's chamber, subsequent receivers are regularly called clerks of the secret seal. In 1349, petitions of the crown to the curia, for the advancement of chamber officers, thus described Richard Norwich, soon after his appointment as receiver in 1349,² and the wardrobe accounts officially so styled him in 1353-54, just before he gave up the receivership.³ On the same day that the papal grant was made to Norwich in 1349, a similar favour was bestowed on Thomas Bramber, who was also described as clerk of the secret seal.⁴ Norwich's probable successor, William Wykeham, as we have seen, was, in 1361, described as clerk of the king's chamber and king's secretary, in a petition sent by the king to the pope about Wykeham's promotion.⁵

¹ See above, chap. iii. 145.

² *C. Pap. Reg. Pet.* i. 153. Petition granted Oct. 15. He became receiver on June 25; *E.A.* 391/1.

³ *Ib.* 392/2 f. 40d. "Domino Ricardo de Norwico, clerico secreti sigilli, pro robis suis estivalibus et hiemalibus de anno xxvii^o," i.e. January 1353 to January 1354. Norwich's allowance for robes was the same as that of each of the four clerks of the privy seal. No doubt other notices of the same sort have escaped my attention. These books are numerous and long, and it is not easy to find one's way about in them.

⁴ *C. Pap. Reg. Pet.* i. 182.

⁵ *Ib.* i. 373, 380. The entry in *C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 421, that William of Wykeham received two recognisances which were cancelled because the king was contented with the sum paid by the recognitor to Helming Leget, receiver of the chamber, may be a reference to Wykeham's work as clerk of the chamber. The date is Aug. 11, 1362.

Wykeham, like Bramber, went from the chamber to the keepership of the privy seal. In this connection we may refer once more to the ambiguous passage of John Malvern, who tells us that Edward III. rewarded Wykeham's building activities by giving him the custody of his secret seal.¹

When the receivership of the chamber passed into lay hands, despite the mild anti-clericalism of the closing years of the reign, it is unlikely that the lay receivers also kept the secret seal. It is more probable that its care went to some chamber clerk, subordinate to them. For us it is enough that the keepership of the secret seal was, during the great period of chamber activity, associated with one of the receivers, probably the chief receiver. The dissociation of the two offices most likely implies the appointment of a keeper *ad hoc* and therefore a step forward. But the problem of the custody of the secret seal in the latter part of Edward III.'s reign still remains difficult. I am inclined to believe that during these days the secret seal, more often called the signet, had a special keeper to whom the title of king's secretary was gradually restricted, though definite evidence of an official so called only emerges in the next reign.

The entrusting of the king's secret seal to an officer of the chamber was not, of course, peculiar to England. We have already more than once recorded the fact that the chamberlain was the keeper of the secret seal of the king of France. The same usage obtained in the elaborate household of the Valois dukes of Burgundy, where the chief chamberlain kept the secret seal of the dukes.² The main difference between the two countries was that a layman kept the French king's secret seal, while its English equivalent was always in the hands of clerks. An additional reason for the English king's adoption of the French custom of keeping his personal seal in the chamber is to be found in the gradual separation, brought about during the reign of Edward III., between the privy seal and the wardrobe. Consequently it was the more important that the secret seal should be kept in the chamber, whose officers were peculiarly intimately

¹ Malvern, p. 360, "et infra breve tempus post suum secretum sigillum fecit portare." I fear, however, that Malvern here only refers to Wykeham's keepership of the privy seal in 1363.

² See for this G. Huydts' "Le Premier Chambellan des Ducs de Bourgogne" in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Henri Pirenne*, i. 263-270 (1926).

associated with the king. It followed naturally from this that the secret seal would still accompany the king on his travels.

To the domestic staff of the chamber and to the other chamber officers of whom we have just spoken, we must add the whole of the privy wardrobe staff, since that was in a sense part of the staff of the comprehensive chamber. The fact that it still seemed natural, at the end of the fourteenth century, for the same person to serve both as keeper of the privy wardrobe, and as receiver of the chamber, shows the strength of the tie between the two offices. We can also add to them such officers as the keepers of the king's ships, like Matthew Torksey, "keeper of the king's ships at the Tower" in 1353,¹ and Nicholas Pike, "keeper of our ships," who accounted in the chamber before the steward and auditors in June 1353.²

We have already pointed out that the revival of the chamber estate involved an increase of the chamber staff. Each group of chamber lands naturally had its local keeper, whose relation to his charge was little affected by the change of accountability. We can illustrate this from the keepers of the great chamber estate which centred round Burstwick. In 1332, on the eve of the reservation of Burstwick to the chamber, a new keeper, Thomas Sinningthwait, had been appointed to answer for it at the exchequer. When Burstwick became a chamber estate, Sinningthwait remained keeper, but was instructed to answer in the chamber, and that from a date some months earlier than the actual change. His immediate successors as keepers of Burstwick were Simon Grimsby (1334 to 1338), William Lenglish (1338 to 1344) and John Darcy, the younger (1344 to 1346). Their names are only worth recording because we shall hear of them again as holding additional offices, when circumstances multiplied chamber duties and it was natural to accumulate some of them in the hands of the men on the spot. Contrariwise, officers of the central authority were given local keeperships. Philip Weston, for example, auditor and steward, was also keeper of Carisbrooke.³

In the period of its reconstitution, the chamber estate was but

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1350-54, p. 517.

² *E.A.* 391/8, no. 10. Compare *ib.* no. 12 and *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 563, which shows N. Pike, king's sergeant, already accounting in the chamber in 1337.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1343-45, p. 34.

a series of manors scattered over the country with little in common, except accountability to the chamber. If it was to be simply a means of providing the chamber with an income, there would be no need to strengthen the ties which bound together the component parts. But many of them already possessed wide immunities from ordinary jurisdiction, so that some central direction for them was almost essential. Such control would be especially necessary if the chamber system were to be exploited to the full to strengthen the royal power, and be, as under the younger Despenser, the peculiar bulwark of prerogative. Between 1320 and 1326 there had functioned stewards, auditors and controllers of the chamber, whose mission was to keep a tight hold over the chamber lands and secure from them for the crown as much profit as was possible.¹ Even the removal of most of the contrariants' lands from chamber jurisdiction in 1322 had not destroyed, though it had diminished, the need for these officers.² They were never more actively employed than between 1327 and 1330, and later, when they had to justify their accounts for the sometime chamber lands before the auditors of foreign accounts of the exchequer. This task was hardly finished when the reservation of Burstwick in 1333 reintroduced a landed chamber. It is evidence of the incompleteness of the restoration of the chamber lands that no such officers were needed until 1337. Even then, the functions of controller, surveyor and auditor, sharply divided under Edward II., were merged in a single office, and it seems as if preparations for the great war, rather than refinements of domestic administration, were the immediate cause of the development of the chamber staff. It is clear that the chamber was an important element in the special war administration then being built up.

In 1337 two new officers were constituted who were indifferently called stewards, surveyors, auditors or controllers³ of the

¹ See above, ii. 343-348.

² *Ib.* ii. 340-343. Some statements in my text, especially the assertion on p. 341 that the auditors of the contrariants' lands were special auditors of the chamber, must be corrected in the light of Dr. Broome's "Auditors of Foreign Accounts in the Exchequer, 1310-27" in *E.H.R.* xxxviii. 63-71. My erratum to ii. 341 tends to darken counsel, for these auditors were not the auditors of foreign accounts, but special officers appointed *ad hoc*.

³ The keepers of individual chamber estates still sometimes had their accounts "controlled" after the old fashion. See *C.F.R.* v. 183, where the keepers of the

chamber. Their number was subsequently varied and their duties more clearly defined and correlated. Substantially, however, the official group thus called into being went on with the same sort of work for the next eighteen years. Broadly speaking, they were to act as liaison officers between the local keepers and the central chamber office. They were to visit and supervise the lands, castles, wardships and other possessions administered by the chamber. Also, they were to audit the accounts of the keepers of the chamber manors, as well as the accounts of the receivers who were responsible for the issues of chamber lands and the whole of the moneys appertaining to the chamber, including advances from the exchequer and wardrobe, and armour, cloth, victuals, jewels and other things concerning the wardrobe and chamber.¹ For this auditing work other officers might, if necessary, be associated with them, and the receiver himself was upon occasion appointed to audit the accounts of his local subordinates.² Moreover, these officers were "to do other things relating to the chamber, as is more fully contained in indentures made between the king and them."³ These, upon occasion, included the task of "surveying the king's ships and the things belonging to them, the king's studs, war horses and great horses, throughout the whole realm, and all armour, jewels, money and other things connected with the chamber and its administration."⁴ All such miscellaneous duties touched the king's intimate interests and afford further proof of the intention to make the chamber a special organ of the prerogative. At the time these new burdens were imposed, the chief steward was declared exempt from any liability for himself and his heirs to render account to the king for his office.⁵ Not only, as we have seen in other relations, was accounting to the exchequer barred;⁶ even personal accountability to the king was also excluded.

temporalities of the see of York answered in 1340 in the chamber, by the view and testimony of Ralph Neville, principal surveyor thereof. Neville discharged the same function in the earlier grant which directed answering in the exchequer; *ib.* p. 170.

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 256, makes this absolutely clear.

² For instance, *ib.*, 1340-43, p. 254, where Hatfield, then receiver, was in 1341 appointed with two others to audit the accounts of Nicholas Buckland and John Cory, late keepers of the Molyns forfeitures, reserved to the chamber. Compare *C.C.R.*, 1345-48, pp. 139-141.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 429-430.

⁴ *Ib.*, 1338-40, p. 4.

⁵ *Ib.*, 1338-40, p. 4.

⁶ For some of their less specifically chamber functions, the stewards were directed to account at the exchequer.

The first "surveyors and auditors," appointed on April 1, 1337, were John Molyns, knight, and Nicholas Buckland, king's clerk.¹ Of these, Buckland had already been in charge of the memoranda and documents concerning the chamber since 1335² and was to remain responsible for them until his death in 1348. Molyns, of whom we have heard a good deal before,³ was the more important of the pair. He was already dignified enough to be treated as the chief steward and to be expected to act by deputy. In 1338 he received additional powers,⁴ and, though sometimes with the king in Brabant, his constant journeys to and fro enabled him to supervise the chamber work in England. Before Edward's return to the continent in June 1340, both Molyns and Buckland were formally reappointed to the auditorship.⁵ The "faithful service" of Molyns did not rise superior to the temptations thrown in his way by the king's sojourn beyond sea, and when, on November 30, the king returned from his second absence, Molyns was involved in the *coup d'état* which followed.⁶ By a curious turn of fate, his lands and goods taken into the king's hands were reserved to the chamber which he had administered so recently, his old colleague Buckland and John Cory, king's clerk, being appointed keepers of them.⁷ Buckland then stepped into Molyns' place as chief steward and auditor, while Cory obtained the second position which Buckland relinquished. The result was that Buckland and Cory were so much occupied with the audit of chamber accounts that on June 1, 1341, they were superseded in the custody of the Molyns forfeitures by other officials, of one of whom, Henry Greystock, king's clerk, we shall hear again.⁸ On

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 429-30.

² *C.W.* 1337/65. Compare *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 567. He had previously been in the service of the earl of Salisbury; *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 140.

³ See iii. 89, 97, 98, 112, 114.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, pp. 4, 93. He was exempted from accounting, but only because "he does not by reason of his office intermeddle in anything for which he might be called on to render accounts." This remark clearly shows the essential difference between the steward and the receiver of the chamber.

⁵ Their joint commitment was enrolled on the fine roll for Jan. 6, 1341; *C.F.R.* v. 199. Compare *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, pp. 538-539, which shows that Buckland's appointment was on June 11.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, pp. 127, 254. He was restored in 1345 "of the king's special favour"; *C.C.R.*, 1343-46, pp. 603-606, 610.

⁷ For details, and his later career, see iii. 123.

⁸ *C.F.R.* v. 225. Compare *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 387. I can find no enrolment of Cory's appointment, but he was already acting in June 1341.

February 23, 1342, Philip Weston was appointed Buckland's colleague as surveyor and auditor.¹ When king's almoner and confessor, Weston had been a prominent actor in the ministerial revolution of November 1340, and his new post was perhaps better adapted to his tastes than his former spiritual functions. Weston and Buckland went on together until 1348, and the former at once took the first place.² Indeed, Buckland's description, in 1344, as lieutenant of the steward of chamber lands suggests a more complete subordination to Weston,³ now commonly described as steward of the chamber.⁴ Though Weston shared with Buckland the work of the audit, Buckland was generally distinguished from him, as time went on, by being called auditor of the chamber. This division of labour may well represent what had obtained previously with Molyns and Buckland. The experiment of a knightly head having been disastrous, it was a stroke of policy to put in his place a clerk so devoted to the king as Weston. In 1346 Weston was "charged with other business beyond seas" and Henry Greystock appointed his deputy, both when absent and present.⁵ On August 23, 1348, Weston's appointment was renewed.⁶ In 1347 he had been nominated dean of York by the king,⁷ but the pope preferred a French cardinal and never suffered him to hold the office.⁸ He was still steward on May 5, 1349,⁹ but was "late steward" on February 15, 1350.¹⁰ A consequence of his failure to obtain his deanery was that £2000, advanced to him out of the chamber, when he was steward, remained unpaid in that year.¹¹

Two months after Weston's abortive nomination to York, Henry Greystock, his sometime deputy, had been appointed

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 386. In 1343 Weston and Buckland are described as auditors of chamber accounts; *C.C.R.*, 1341-43, p. 618.

² See, for instance, *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 573.

³ *C.F.R.* v. 370.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, shows this clearly. The auditing was subsidiary to the stewardship. Compare *ib.*, 1348-50, p. 65.

⁵ *Ib.*, 1346-48, p. 43. The deputyship, made originally by Weston, was on that day confirmed by the king. Weston attended the king on the whole Crécy-Calais campaign with a considerable retinue; Wrotesley, *Crécy and Calais*, especially pp. 94, 205.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 143. He was appointed to "survey and audit."

⁷ *Ib.*, 1345-48, p. 263.

⁸ He was still called dean of York in royal writs of 1351; *ib.*, 1350-54, p. 48. So late as 1363 Weston was pardoned all debts and accounts as minister of the chamber or otherwise in consideration of his good service; *ib.*, 1361-64, p. 317. His successful rival was a Talleyrand of Périgord, cardinal bishop of Albano.

⁹ *C.F.R.* vi. 110.

¹⁰ *Ib.* p. 213.

¹¹ *Ib.* p. 249.

surveyor to the chamber on May 31, 1347.¹ The phrasing of the patent was unusual, for nothing was said in it about auditing, but among his duties were specified the surveying of all works and repairs of castles, manors and ships, reserved to the chamber, all payments of wages of chamber ministers, all receipts, issues and accounts of chamber lands, the control of all receipts, payments and accounts, as well as the examination and enrolment of letters under the griffin seal. This latter duty points to a healthy growth of the secretariat and record office for the chamber lands. His wages were to be 2s. a day. Besides deputising for Weston, Greystock had had a long chamber experience. Already a clerk of the chamber in 1335, he had kept the archives of that office from that time until October 4, 1348.² Since 1343 he had been keeper of Easthampstead, Henley in Surrey,³ and other chamber lands,⁴ and had been commissioned, with Buckland, to farm out chamber lands for a period of seven years, when they found that course was to the king's advantage.⁵ He brought, therefore, knowledge of local as well as central chamber administration to the discharge of this office. For a short time he had Weston as his superior and Buckland as his colleague, but Buckland was already dead on May 23, 1349,⁶ and no successor to him seems to have been appointed.

With Buckland's death and Weston's retirement, Greystock stood forth clearly as sole steward and chief officer of the chamber. In May 1349, his earlier appointment was renewed and extended in order to regularise his position. By this a good deal more was implied than appears on the surface, for we shall see later ⁷ that it was the first suggestion that the break-up of the chamber estate was already envisaged. Greystock was the last of the stewards of the chamber. He remained in office until reservation of lands to the chamber ceased, in 1356, and he presided over the settlement and rearrangements consequent on the change. In 1351, he was also nominated, along with John Brocas, knight, to survey

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 299. Compare *E.A.* 20/27 for his naval work.

² *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 567.

³ *Ib.*, 1343-46, pp. 158, 192.

⁴ *Ib.* pp. 603, 610; *ib.*, 1346-49, p. 437.

⁵ *C.F.R.* v. 329.

⁶ *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 38, shows that he was dead on May 23, 1349, as his executors were ordered to surrender the chamber archives to the crown. Buckland lost custody of these on Oct. 4, 1348 (*ib.*, 1346-49, p. 567), but apparently died before their transference could be effected.

⁷ See below, pp. 284, 300-301.

the king's studs and horses,¹ a commission which was renewed to the same officers in 1352.²

Long before Greystock's time, a tradition of chamber administration was definitely established. Most of the mandates on chamber business were addressed to the steward and auditors, the steward taking precedence of the auditors, who were now several in number.³ The audit for which these latter were responsible took place, we are told, "at the receipt of the chamber," doubtless in the localised headquarters of the office, first in the Tower of London and later at Westminster.⁴ It is pretty clear that in the audits exchequer methods were adopted.

We have still to discuss the other new functionaries, who, like the stewards and auditors, were found necessary for the administration of the lands of the chamber, but who, unlike the stewards and auditors, had a strictly local jurisdiction limited to those lands. The most interesting of these were the justices, coroners and escheators of the chamber. The appointment of all such officers, but particularly of the justices, followed habitually on the grant of extensive immunities to the district. In liberties such as Burstwick, the justices of assize had no jurisdiction. Even the justices of the common bench, though not denied a certain authority, were enjoined to behave circumspectly in that district, "so that nothing might arise to the king's prejudice in his liberty." On no account was a writ of *nisi prius* to be issued, returnable "in another place," though inquisitions were only to be taken in the bench at Westminster.⁵ Some time before this, a commission of oyer and terminer, including among its members the chamber knight John Molyns,⁶ had been set up to deal with one of these cases. Even this was

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1350-54, p. 48.

² *Ib.* pp. 275-276.

³ A large number of such mandates for the middle period of Edward III. are preserved among the exchequer accounts. See, for example, *E.A.* 391/8, documents subsidiary to accounts of the chamber 20-27, Edw. III. This consists mainly of rescripts and originals of letters under the griffin seal. The majority of them are in French, but some are in Latin. The normal address of the latter is "senescallo camere nostre et auditoribus compotorum eiusdem camere." Some are also addressed to the receiver, and one to the steward, receivers and auditors.

⁴ See later, pp. 281-283.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, pp. 171-172, 173-174, gives several writs to two justices of the bench, then acting as justices of assize in Yorkshire, forbidding them, in two Burstwick cases that had been brought before them, taking inquisitions by writs of *nisi prius*, and ordering them to hear the cases in the bench. This was in 1339.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 66.

unsatisfactory, but at last the difficulty was surmounted by the appointment of special justices of the chamber.

As the districts were limited and the number of cases few, it was generally convenient to give the stewards or auditors special commissions to hear pleas in chamber districts. For instance, in 1342 Weston and Buckland, who were associated with two others to hear, in the Isle of Wight, certain complaints against the king's ministers there, were really justices of the chamber.¹ More officially were Henry Greystock and his fellows, in 1350, appointed justices "to hear divers trespasses and excesses in the liberty of Holderness."² In 1351 John Darcy, a former keeper and escheator,³ was head of the justices of Holderness,⁴ and in 1352-53, special commissions of keepers of the peace and justices of labourers were appointed for the district.⁵ We know also that in March 1352 the justices for chamber business sat for four days at Hedon in Holderness. The expenses of the justices at Hedon were paid by the then escheator and receiver or keeper of Holderness, Peter Grimsby,⁶ who was thereby doing the work of a sheriff within the liberty as well. For its franchises excluded the jurisdiction of justice, sheriff, coroner, escheator and exchequer alike, and even a collector for tenths and fifteenths was specially appointed for Holderness, the only non-county area so treated in 1352.⁷ Holderness was thus a self-contained franchise, responsible only to the king in his chamber. It was as free from the ordinary jurisdictions as were the forests, almost as free as a palatinate, and had substantially the organisation of a shire, like

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1341-43, p. 518.

² *Ib.*, 1349-54, p. 263.

³ See later, p. 273.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, pp. 283, 289, 311. For pleas before Darcy, Greystock and their fellows, justices of oyer and terminer in Holderness, see *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, pp. 474-475. They sat at Burstwick, Hedon and Beverley.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 543. Peter Grimsby, then escheator and bailiff, was among them. But compare *C.P.R.*, 1350-54, p. 278.

⁶ See for details *E.A.* 392/7: "Memorandum quod Petrus de Grymesby soluit pro expensis justiciariorum in negociis camere regis apud Hedon, mense Marcii anno vicesimo sexto per quatuor dies sedencium ex mandato regis sub secreto sigillo suo—lxj. s. j. d. ob. Item predictus Petrus soluit Roberto de Acastr', vni clericorum justiciariorum predictorum, pro stipendio et labore suo per idem tempus, x. s. Item predictus Petrus soluit pro quodam torge expedito in negociis regis pro vna inquisitione capienda apud Hedon in vigilia Epiphanie Domini anno. xxiiij^{to}—xij. d. Et sic est summa istarum solucionum per testimonium Henrici de Greystock qui huic bille sigillum suum apposuit—lxxij. s. j. d. ob."

⁷ *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 437.

Durham or Glamorgan or Chester. It was, to use later language, a "county in itself."

In such circumstances, it went without saying that there were special coroners of chamber lands. Indeed, John Carlton was coroner in the liberty of Holderness even before its annexation to the chamber.¹ His accountability was soon transferred to the chamber. Yet the king was compelled to protect him in 1338 by a mandate to the exchequer not to distrain or intermeddle with him further, as the king wished that answer should be made in his chamber for the goods and chattels of felons and fugitives of Holderness, and therefore had ordered Carlton not to deliver up his rolls to the exchequer.² On January 20, 1341, Thomas Lindlow was made coroner of Holderness during the king's pleasure.³

The special escheators of the chamber were more clearly indicated than the justices and coroners. As early as the days of the Despensers, the ordinary escheators were excluded from holding inquests in chamber lands and some chamber clerk or yeoman acted in their stead.⁴ Under Edward III. the new arrangement of having a special escheator for chamber lands began in Holderness, a district which in this, as in many other relations, formed a precedent later to be followed by other such regions. On June 11, 1334, Simon Grimsby, king's yeoman, already appointed, on February 21, keeper of the manor of Burstwick, was nominated to "the office of the escheatry within the liberty of Holderness, so that he answer in the chamber for the issues thereof," and the escheator of the northern shires was instructed to deliver that office to him.⁵ Next month, on July 30, 1334, when all escheators were ordered to bring to the exchequer all the money they could raise, a special exemption was made in favour of the escheator of Holderness "because he answers in the king's chamber for

¹ He was appointed on May 6, 1332, to answer at the exchequer; *C.F.R.* iv. 313. As he paid the yearly rent that others had paid, it was clearly not a new office.

² *C.C.R.*, 1337-39, p. 359.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 83.

⁴ See above, ii. 354.

⁵ *C.F.R.* iv. 405; see *ib.* p. 387 for his appointment as keeper, "so that he answer in the chamber for the issues thereof," and *ib.* pp. 404-405, where, on June 6, the escheator of the north was ordered not to meddle further with Burstwick. It looks as if he were the Simon Grimsby who was escheator north of Trent between 1324 and 1329; *ib.* iii. 283, iv. 1, 2, 77, 101. On the face of it, the earlier was the more important office.

the issues of that escheatry.”¹ Grimsby was still in office on September 18, 1337, when he was ordered to go to the chamber to render his account, on the king’s forewarning him to do so.² He was succeeded on February 20, 1338, by another king’s yeoman, William Lenglish,³ who was ordered on October 20, 1339, to render his accounts, to be audited in the king’s chamber.⁴ Like Grimsby, Lenglish was keeper of Burstwick as well as escheator. He died, when still in office, in the summer of 1344.⁵ His final accounts, presented by his executors, were accepted some time before February 1346.⁶ On October 1, 1344, he was succeeded, both as keeper and escheator of Burstwick, by John Darcy, “the son,” whose appointment was for life.⁷ However, on March 16, 1346, Darcy was replaced as escheator by Nicholas Gower, king’s yeoman, and was released for his “good service,” from any account for his issues as keeper.⁸ Gower did not combine the escheatry with the keepership, but held only the former office until May 11, 1349,⁹ when Peter Grimsby, who

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1333–37, p. 245. The phrasing of the writ makes it clear that Grimsby was then the only chamber escheator, for the only other exceptions were as regards the mayors of London and Newcastle, ex-officio escheators as mayors, who were ordered to send their money to the exchequer but were not threatened with loss of office if they defaulted.

² *C.F.R.* v. 43. For the delay in his settlement, see *ib.* vi. 261, and later, p. 283. Before the account was adjusted Grimsby died, some time before Oct. 5, 1348. His lands were thereupon seized by the chamber until his debts to it were paid. His Grimsby property was still accountable in the chamber in 1354, so that even then his accounts were not settled; *M.R.K.R.* 132 com. Hil.

³ *Ib.* v. 67; cf. *ib.* p. 83.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1339–41, p. 207.

⁵ He was alive on April 26, 1344; *C.F.R.* v. 377, but died before Oct. 1; *ib.* p. 390. The William Lenglish, knight, granted the forest of Inglewood was, I suspect, the son and executor of the escheator (*ib.* v. 402), who never attained that rank.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1345–48, p. 76, exemplification of Feb. 13, under the great seal, for the security of his executors, of the accounts of Lenglish rendered before Buckland and his fellow-auditors. The warranty for this writ was a letter under the griffin seal.

⁷ *C.F.R.* v. 390. His father, John Darcy “le pere,” was at that time king’s chamberlain. He is the one man of position who held this office, and only for the profits, one suspects.

⁸ *Ib.* v. 456. See also, for Darcy’s account, *E.A.* 391/8, doc. 1. This is a writ directed to the steward and auditors of the chamber, dated Feb. 12, 1352, reciting that Darcy had accounted up to Mar. 16, 1346, “to the king” and had been acquitted, and ordering the chamber to exonerate him from further accounting.

⁹ *Ib.* vi. 110, “so that he answers in the chamber for the issues thereof.”

had, since March 16, 1346, acted as receiver of Holderness,¹ replaced him. Peter went on at least until 1354, but by December 3, 1355, William Fililode had become escheator.² Fililode was ordered to account at the exchequer, and thus became simply escheator of a franchise.³

Another escheatorship for the chamber was devised in 1342 for the Isle of Wight, when, on March 15, the district escheator was ordered to surrender the escheatry of the island to Roger Liseway, who was to answer for its issues to the king in his chamber.⁴ Similarly, on February 20, 1345, William Ringbourn, his successor, was appointed with orders to answer in the chamber.⁵ Ringbourn was still acting on October 10, 1352,⁶ but was succeeded on April 20, 1353, by John Kingston, king's clerk,⁷ already, since June 1350, keeper of the alien priories of the island, reserved for the chamber.⁸ He had also, on June 25, 1351, been appointed keeper of the lands and goods in the Isle of Wight reserved for the king's chamber, and "steward of the king's court of knights" at Newport, answering for these offices in the chamber.⁹ Kingston was serving as escheator as late as April 1355.¹⁰

Even after the appointment of chamber escheators for Holderness and Wight, other chamber lands still, for a brief period, remained in subjection to the ordinary escheators responsible to the exchequer. However, a symmetrical system of chamber escheatry was attained when, on February 25, 1348, William Berkhamsted was made escheator in all the lands reserved or to be reserved to the chamber in any counties, save in the Isle of

¹ *C.F.R.* v. 456. This was with the assent of John Darcy "le fitz." As the elder Darcy died soon after, his son's accession to a large estate speedily put him above such a local office. Peter's appointment was renewed on May 11 unconditionally; *ib.* vi. 110. But Darcy was justice of Holderness in 1351; see above, p. 271. Peter's wage was only 2*d.* a day.

² *Ib.* vi. 444.

³ *Ib.* vi. 412.

⁴ *Ib.* v. 263 is misleading in the extreme. Roger Liseway did not receive a "like commitment" of the escheatry to answer in the exchequer. The calendar ignores the crucial words: "ita quod de exitibus inde prouenientibus regi respondeat in cameram regis"; *F.R.* 142/31. It is still advisable in cases of ambiguity to consult the original rolls rather than have implicit faith that the calendars give all the necessary information.

⁵ *Ib.* v. 409, "so that he answer in the chamber for the issues thereof."

⁶ *Ib.* vi. 347.

⁷ *Ib.* vi. 355. The warranty "by letter of the griffin" shows it was still a chamber escheatry.

⁸ *Ib.* vi. 244.

⁹ *Ib.* vi. 303.

¹⁰ *Ib.* vi. 422.

Wight and Holderness.¹ Berkhamsted was also made keeper and surveyor of all knights' fees in such lands, and directed to answer at the receipt of the chamber. He and his successor were commonly addressed as "escheators of the lands reserved to the king's chamber."² They were to act according to the orders directed to them by the steward or auditors of accounts of lands reserved to the chamber. Their successor, Robert Hadham, was appointed on May 9, 1349, on the same terms,³ and the preservation, in enrolment, of the majority of his accounts, enables us to get a clear idea of his work.⁴ On October 4, Hadham was appointed escheator, answering in the chamber, for all chamber lands south of Trent, except in Wight.⁵

The chamber escheators were liable to be called from their proper sphere to co-operate with, or in a sense to supersede, the ordinary escheators. Thus, in 1351, Hadham, as chamber escheator, was present at Ross when the escheator of Hereford and the march⁶ held an inquest as to the lordship of Abergavenny, possessed until his death by Lawrence Hastings, earl of Pembroke, whose heir, John Hastings, was still a young child. Hadham reported the inquest to the king, who, by writ of privy seal, ordered the local escheator to bring the inquest into the king's chamber without delay. Thence it was dispatched direct to the chancellor, bishop Thoresby, who was commanded under the griffin seal,⁷ to have it executed, as if it had been returned to chancery.⁸ Thus not only was the exchequer deprived of authority, but chancery also was reduced to a formal ratification of orders when dealing with lands on which the chamber had designs. As there is no evidence that Abergavenny had been reserved to the chamber, it looks as if the chamber escheator could, by appearing at an

¹ *Ib.* vi. 73. The warrant, under griffin seal, is in *C.W.* 1337.

² *C.C.R.*, 1349, p. 442; *ib.*, 1349-54, p. 11.

³ *C.F.R.* vi. 137, "by bill of Philip Weston."

⁴ *Pipe*, 201/40 (30 E. III.) gives his accounts from May 9, 1349 to Sept. 1356. Hadham is described as "escaetor regis de omnibus terris et tenementis, feodis militum, et aduocationibus ecclesiarum et omnibus aliis ad cameram regis reseruatis"; but we are told that the patent of appointment excepted the Isle of Wight and the king's domain of Holderness from his commission. He was appointed "ad omnia profuita et exitus inde prouenientia leuanda et regi inde ad receptam predicte camere respondenda."

⁵ *C.F.R.* vi. 177, 186, "by letter under the seal called griffoun."

⁶ On Oct. 18, 1351, Thomas Aston was appointed sheriff and escheator; *ib.*, vi. 307, 308.

⁷ See for this later, pp. 276-278.

⁸ *Cal. Inq.* ix. 124-125.

inquest, earmark any estate for cameral jurisdiction. It was doubtless because Hadham's inquiries showed the unsatisfactory condition of the lordship, that the king, six months later, handed its custody, during the minority of the heir, to a keeper who accounted at the chamber.¹

Such special powers of the chamber were not to last. A writ of January 20, 1356, ordered Hadham to tender his accounts in the exchequer, and we shall see that this was part of the winding up of the organisation of the chamber estate. Though Hadham remained escheator of these lands for some time longer, he was described as escheator of "the lands recently reserved to the chamber."² For the future we hear no more of escheators of the chamber, or of its stewards and auditors. Yet the greater chamber estates kept up their identity, and special escheators, notably in Holderness, continued for much longer. Indeed, the carrying on of such chamber lands as franchises, held by the king or his near kin, prevented any great change in their status. The difference was that their escheators were now part of the general system and amenable to exchequer control.

Before dismissing the subject of the staffing of the chamber, we must deal with the problem of the secretariat of the section of the office concerned with the reserved lands. We have seen that, before lands were reserved to the chamber, there had been a chamber secretariat and a chamber seal, and that under Edward II. that secretariat and seal had been adequate for the requirements of the chamber estate. In the reign of Edward III. the

¹ *C.F.R.* vi. 330. This was in June 1352. The proceedings described in the text took place between the previous December and February.

² There is a further account of Hadham in *Pipe*, 204/43d (33 Edw. III.): "Compotus Roberti de Hadham, escaetoris camere regis, de exitibus quorundam terrarum et tenementorum nuper ad eandem reseruaturum." It extends from Michaelmas 1358 to Michaelmas 1359. This account was, of course, presented to the exchequer, and was limited to the manor of West Wittenham, Berks. Another of Hadham's accounts is in *Enroll. Accts. Esch.* 40/20d, which shows him accounting, as escheator, for numerous manors between March 1356 and March 1359. It was not until 1360 that he was ordered to surrender to the local escheators the former chamber lands in Dorset and Berks., which he still had in his charge; *C.F.R.* vii. 127. Hadham was also escheator of Middlesex between 1349 and 1355, answering as usual in the exchequer; *C.F.R.* vi. 119-442 gives as extreme dates of his service, June 23, 1349, and Sept. 1, 1355. He was, on Apr. 1, 1353, made keeper of John Molyns' former grant from the king of knights' fees of Pinkney and Chokes, for which fees he accounted in the chamber; *ib.* p. 359. The dual responsibility to the exchequer and chamber is interesting.

officials dealing with the chamber lands had appointed for their use a new type of secret seal, called, from the effigy borne on it, the seal of the griffin. The first mention that I have found of this seal is in a letter patent of December 7, 1335, which relates that William Kilsby, then receiver of the chamber, had given "letters patent under the king's secret seal called the griffin" to the keeper of the hanaper as an acknowledgment of a payment by him for the king's use.¹ The griffin was clearly a chamber seal, used apparently as a variant to the secret seal, and perhaps devised because the secret seal was with the king in Scotland or the north of England. Within four years, it had become specialised for the service of the chamber lands office,² and after a long struggle, the exchequer was compelled to accept its warrants, in matters appertaining to the chamber estate, as equivalent to a writ of privy seal.³ In 1346 its sphere was widened to include all things touching the chamber,⁴ but, in point of fact, it remained substantially the instrument of the chamber landed estate, until it disappeared, with the lands themselves, in 1356. It was, therefore, in theory, strictly a departmental seal, even if in practice it was mainly concerned with the lands' sub-department of the chamber. In all this history repeats itself. Just as the privy seal arose in the primitive wardrobe or chamber, and when it became a public instrument was replaced in the household by the secret seal, so, when household administration became more complex, the griffin seal sprang up to supplement the secret seal. Before the end of the century, we shall see the secret seal in its

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 455.

² So late as 1338 a letter of secret seal could be sent to Grimsby, an officer of chamber lands, on chamber business; *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 66. Perhaps the griffin never had exclusive authority.

³ Two writs of Feb. 28 and Mar. 6, 1339, in almost identical terms, ordered the exchequer to regard griffin seal letters as a sufficient warrant for disbursement to any officer of the chamber; *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, pp. 25, 31; the second writ is in *Foedera*, ii. 1076. The mandates were repeated in another writ of Mar. 13, 1341; (*ib.* ii. 1152; *C.C.R.*, 1341-43, p. 28), and again on Aug. 25, 1341 (*ib.* p. 215), this order being issued when the king was in England. There was a further repetition on Jan. 3, 1342; *ib.* p. 331. The reluctance of the exchequer to accept these warrants must have been extreme. An analogous order to chancery, declaring a writ of griffin seal necessary to warrant grants or presentations affecting chamber lands, was issued at Westminster on Oct. 12; *C.W.* 1336/58. The year is not given, but I suspect it to be 1341, the first year the king was in England after the consolidation of the chamber lands. For details as to the secret and griffin seals see later, vol. v. ch. xvii.

⁴ *M.R.K.R.* 122, breu. dir. bar., Hilary, 20 Ed. III.

turn emerging from the chamber, and becoming, under its new name of signet, the instrument of an independent secretarial department, to which the future was to bring great things. But the signet office, with the king's secretary and his staff of assistants, are only clearly revealed to us in the reign of Richard II.¹ Under Edward III. nothing more can be proved than a tendency in this direction.

We know even less about the custody of the griffin seal than we know about that of the secret seal. Just as the latter was one of the responsibilities of the chief receiver, so the chief steward was ultimately charged with the care of the griffin seal. The existence of two seals in one office has no parallel, and at first sight tempts us to suppose that there was a "chamber of lands" as distinct from the normal "king's chamber." Indeed, so far were the two seals separately administered that, as late as 1350, a letter of secret seal might be a warrant for a letter under the griffin seal,² though this shows the subordination of the department of reserved lands rather than its autonomy. Although the care of neither seal was the province of a seal-keeper, appointed *ad hoc*, but an incident of the many miscellaneous duties of the departmental chief, the receiver or the chief steward, there must have been some sort of staff, not only to draw up, record and preserve the numerous documents emanating from the various departments of the chamber, but also to record and preserve the communications addressed to that office. But such secretariats seem always to have been short-handed and unspecialised. Like the wardrobe clerks of earlier times, the chamber clerks were habitually unable to cope with the business entrusted to them, and were forced to borrow clerical assistants from other departments. Thus, in 1349-50, the chamber paid sums of money to the various clerks of the exchequer for their labours in the affairs of the chamber, as well as to a clerk of chancery for making divers commissions and writs touching the chamber.³ Not until long

¹ See on this subject, Miss L. B. Dibben's article on "Secretaries in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries," in *E.H.R.* xxv. 430-444. Her doctrine of a "subordinate secretary" so early as 1347, cannot, however, be regarded as proved. The "household ordinance" of 1347, on whose evidence she relies, is not a household ordinance at all, but a series of extracts from wardrobe accounts put together by an unknown Tudor antiquary.

² *E.A.* 391/8, under date of Dec. 18, 1350.

³ *Ib.* 391/20. *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 571, shows that William Hawksworth was a chancery clerk of the second form.

after the griffin seal came to an end was an adequate chamber secretariat established.

The chamber looked after and preserved its own archives, but these shared the fate of all the records of household administration, and no longer survive as a body. Such as accident has saved are mainly to be found among the archives of the exchequer, into which many came when, in 1356, the chamber's jurisdiction over royal estates was relinquished and the exchequer resumed its former authority. There are, however, sufficient indications that there were considerable official chamber records, and that their conservation involved not only a secretarial staff, but special premises where they were kept for reference. Among these documents were "extents of lands, rolls of accounts, parcels of accounts, commissions, letters of warrant, tallies and other memoranda of the chamber." Until 1348 at least, the auditors of the accounts of the chamber were the sole official custodians of those records.¹

I have spoken more than once of the strong inclination, during the reign of Edward III., of all government offices to settle down in fixed headquarters in London or Westminster. This tendency was emphasised by the long absences of the king and the consequent division of the ministry. Those sections of the administration left at home had as good reason for remaining in one spot, as those abroad had for being constantly on the move. The chamber was affected by both these considerations. Though essentially part of the royal household, even before the outbreak of foreign war, the chamber had felt the need of a fixed base, as well because it was concerned with the care of goods not easily nor quickly transportable from place to place, as owing to the revival of a landed estate for its use. When, therefore, the office was divided into two to meet the demands of a dual administration, while the foreign section continued to itinerate with the court abroad, the home section became more or less stationary. The earlier differentiation of the chamber into partially autonomous groups made this last step all the easier.

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 567. This writ to the exchequer is dated Oct. 4, 1348. The privy seal on which it is based is in *C.W.* 1337. Both documents show that Nicholas Buckland, auditor of the chamber, had had official charge of the chamber records since 1335. It was his wish to be released that caused the significant change of custody spoken of later, on pp. 281-282.

We have seen that in 1338-40, Hatfield and other leading chamber officers were with the king in the Netherlands, and that during the Crécy-Calais campaign, not only the receivers Burton and Bramber, but also Philip Weston, chief steward of the chamber, accompanied the king.¹ The presence of Weston with the army shows that the officials concerned with the administration of the chamber estate need not always stay in England, but were sometimes more useful on the continent. If there was no exchequer treasury beyond the sea, there was its equivalent in the chamber established in the lines by Calais, and described as "the chamber in parts on this side of the sea."²

Fleet, Mildenhall and Rothwell at the Tower, all in turn served as receivers for the chamber in England.³ They were also keepers of the privy wardrobe in the Tower and keepers of the Tower mint, so that they presided over a small group of government departments, concentrated there for convenience. Besides the receipt operating in the Tower, the greater part of the chamber staff in charge of chamber lands necessarily stayed in England. When Weston went with the king to Normandy, his subordinates, Nicholas Buckland and Henry Greystock, stewards and auditors of the chamber, had their commissions extended "to pursue and defend all the business of the lands and other things appertaining to our chamber, as long as we are outside England," and the chancellor was instructed to give them "aid, counsel, and the necessary writs to carry out their commission."⁴

The war, then, merely accentuated tendencies already felt, and precipitated movements started sometime before. From an early date the chamber had realised the inconvenience and the risk of having charge of a large number of bulky or valuable

¹ See above, iii. 87, 89, 167, 169. *Pipe*, 194/43 (23 Ed. III.). *E.A.* 391/4 shows that Burton's account was "de denariis receptis et solutis tam in cismarinis quam in transmarinis partibus." Wrottesley, pp. 46, 89, 177, shows how they received letters of protection on going with their retinues with the king.

² *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 541, dated "by Calais," June 8, 1347. Even the griffin seal was kept "deuers Calays" from Nov. 1346 to Nov. 1347; *C.W.* 1337/39-49.

³ See above, pp. 258-259.

⁴ *C.W.* 313/17701 (June 27, 1346). The king had already given them a similar charge by word of mouth. The privy seal is thus endorsed: "Que sires Nichol de Bokeland et Henry de Greystoke sont faitz attorner a pursayre et de faire en noun de roi les busoignes touchantes la chaumbre."

articles, which could not, readily and safely, be carried about the country.¹ A safe place for keeping valuables was the Tower of London, and, as early as 1322, we find the receiver of the chamber, James of Spain, purchasing an iron-bound chest to "keep the moneys of the king's chamber in the chapel of the great Tower of London."² Such circumstances afford the best explanation of the growth of the privy wardrobe in the Tower, whose origin and early history were so closely bound up, as we know, with the growth of the chamber. The jewels, plate and treasure; the great stores of arms and armour; the heavy machines and the missiles they projected; the masses of raw material such as hemp, cords, wood and barrels, and the provisions needed for the navy, all required a suitable and permanent place of storage. The result was that the privy wardrobe separated itself from the household. In essence it was the stores department of the chamber, just as the great wardrobe had once been the stores department of the wardrobe. Its close connection with the chamber was kept up for the whole of Edward III.'s reign, as is clear from the significant fact that the keepers of the privy wardrobe were described as chamber clerks, and, frequently, more specifically, as receivers of the king's chamber in the Tower. In 1344, Mary, countess of Pembroke, received the custody of a north county estate, accountable to the chamber, for a rent to be paid to the chamber "at the king's Tower of London."³ There are other examples of similar payment of such rents "in the chamber at the Tower of London" in 1346, or "in the chamber to the king's receiver in the Tower."⁴ Thus the care of valuables and stores and the needs of estate business combined to encourage the localisation of the chamber.

Within twelve months of the king's return to England, after the fall of Calais, a change was made, apparently as the result of an accident, though it may perhaps have been due to the persistent hostility of the exchequer to chamber independence, and to the influence of treasurer Edington on the king. Nicholas

¹ Compare queen Isabella's chamber which, on her death in 1358, contained charters and records, jewels and other "goods and chattels"; *E.A.* 393/4.

² *I.R.* 197/4, 15 Edw. II. Mich. t.: "Roberto de Chisenhale, clerico magistri Jacobi de Ispannia, pro una magna cista, ferro ligata, per ipsum emptā et prouisa, pro denariis de camera domini regis imponendis et nunc in capella in magna Turri Londoniis posita."

³ *C.F.R.* v. 357.

⁴ *Ib.* 455, 468.

Buckland had, since 1335, been responsible for the chamber archives. We do not know where he had kept them, probably in his own house, or possibly in the Tower of London. Now, in 1348, he was seeking relief from this charge, and advantage was taken of his request to alter, seemingly, the whole balance between the chamber and exchequer. On October 4, 1348, the exchequer was ordered to receive from Buckland, auditor of the chamber, all the chamber records in his keeping, and to place them in two chests under lock and key.¹ One key was to remain in the possession of the exchequer, while the other was to be given to the auditors of chamber accounts to enable them to inspect the documents when required. The exchequer was to cause the chests to be placed "in the new chamber in the palace of Westminster appointed for hearing and rendering the accounts of the chamber." For the future the king desired that every year the auditors should deliver to the treasurer, barons and chamberlains, all the accounts heard before them, and the memoranda concerning them, so that the auditors might be discharged, after such livery, from responsibility for them.

Two main points stand out clearly in this remarkable order. The chamber, in particular its audit office, had some little time previously been assigned quarters in Westminster palace, and now it was unmistakably subordinated to its neighbour, the exchequer. The room in the palace occupied by the chamber had apparently only recently been built, and may well have been constructed specially for its purposes. It was in use as early as October 1347,² and although there is no evidence that audit of chamber accounts was being conducted in it at that date, it is by no means impossible. In that event, the deposit of chamber records at Westminster would be not so much an innovation giving rise to further departures, as a natural consequence of former action. But the exchequer was not only given custody of, and free access to, the archives of the chamber, while the chamber auditors, hitherto their sole guardians, were left with no more than authority to consult them whenever business required. It was charged with the more delicate duties of obliging those who ought to account in the chamber to present their accounts

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, pp. 567-568.

² *Ib.*, 1346-49, pp. 396-397; Cf. *ib.*, 1349-54, p. 88.

there, when, as sometimes happened, they proposed to render such accounts to the exchequer instead ; and of imprisoning certain incorrigible chamber accountants who were always in arrears.

The very day after the order of October 4, the exchequer was strictly commanded to supersede taking the accounts of Margery, widow of Simon Grimsby, sometime keeper of Holderness, and informed that, if anyone came before it to account for things reserved to the chamber, it was "to send them to the auditors of the accounts of that place, which the king has appointed within his palace of Westminster, to receive and hear those accounts."¹ At the same time the auditors of the chamber were directed to see that justice was done to all who appeared before them. That the king found it necessary thus to remind the chamber auditors of their duty, may explain why Grimsby's widow, in seeking to get her husband's belated accounts of ten years earlier finally settled, like others responsible for lands and goods accountable at the chamber, preferred to take their accounts to the exchequer for audit. Undoubtedly, chamber audit was excessively dilatory,² and the office does not appear to have had power enough to assert its authority successfully. So well was this recognised now, that nine days later, the exchequer was called upon to lend further assistance by receiving before it, after final audit in the chamber, any who were in arrears, and consigning them to the Fleet prison, as it would other accountants in similar condition. The reason given for the step was that the king had "learned that certain ministers accounting at the chamber, remain charged with arrears upon their accounts."³ We must not overstress the difference between accounting to the chamber and accounting to the exchequer. As far back as 1337, the chamber methods were very much like those of the exchequer. Accounts to the chamber were tendered at Michaelmas and Easter, as were the accounts to the exchequer, so that the two processes took place at the same time of year, and from 1348 at least, in adjacent premises.⁴

¹ *Ib.*, 1346-49, pp. 563-564. See above, p. 273.

² An exchequer return to chancery of Feb. 25, 1356, showed that receiver Rothwell still owed £10 on account of Grimsby's lands; *M.R.K.R.* 132, com. Hil. It needed the great clearance of 1356 to settle even this little matter.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 565.

⁴ *C.F.R.*, v. 29, 171, 468. In the last case the accounting in the chamber was to the king's receiver in the Tower; in the last but one, Buckland was

Buckland had little chance of hindering or of helping the changes. His request for relief was due to bad health, and within a few months he was dead, before he had actually surrendered the archives in his charge. His executors had not made the transfer by May 23, 1349, when the king ordered them to give the archives to Greystock¹ to enable him to carry out his newly augmented duties.² It is clear that Greystock was put in supreme control of the chamber in May 1349, because he was already pledged to the policy either of making the chamber administration of its estate thoroughly effective, or else of restraining and curtailing such activities. Within a month of the several mandates of May 1349, exchequer help for the chamber was increased by the instruction to the exchequer to levy the sums due to the king in his chamber, and to force chamber ministers to account before the auditors of the chamber, according to the information to be supplied to them by Henry Greystock.³ In other words, the more efficient machinery of the exchequer was to be used for the chamber in the attempt to render the continuance of a chamber estate practicable.

The ultimate and most important result of the chamber's acquisition of a fixed base at Westminster, was the close relationship established between it and the exchequer, and the clearer definition of the boundaries between the two. Virtually the chamber was placed in a position of dependence on the exchequer, for, though chamber rights were jealously insisted upon, the fact that the exchequer was brought in to make chamber regulations effective, tacitly admitted that the exchequer was

excused from other duties because he was needed for the chamber audit at Eastertide. Rents to the chamber did not follow this rule. In *ib.* p. 357, chamber rents are found payable at Midsummer and Christmas, thus giving the accounting officer three months' respite before sending in his account.

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 307; *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 38; *C.W.* 1337/76.

² See above, pp. 268-270, 281-282.

³ *C.W.* 1337/77 (June 18, 1349): "qils facent leuer les deniers a nous duz en nostre chambre et facent venir les ministres de mesme la chambre dacompter deuant noz auditours dicelle a toutes les foiz et selom ce qe nostre cher cerc Henry de Greystock . . . lour enformera et signifiera depart nous." The co-operation between Greystock and the exchequer is clearly brought out by the language of this writ of griffin seal, which was the warrant for the writ of chancery issued to the exchequer. This last is enrolled in *M.R.K.R.* 125, breu. dir. bar. (Trin. t. 23 Ed. III.): "omnesque et singulos ministros camere ad computandum coram auditoribus camere . . . et ad hoc, si opus fuerit, juxta modum dicti scaccarii compelli faciatis."

the stronger of the two, and finally left the exchequer in victorious control. We must not, however, exaggerate the subordination of 1348-49, for fresh lands were still from time to time reserved to the chamber, and any attempt on the part of the exchequer to exercise jurisdiction over them was as sternly repressed as ever. Yet it is not too much to say that the powerlessness of the chamber to enforce payment and accountability to itself, was responsible in large measure for the downfall of the scheme of a landed estate for the chamber.

The settlement of the chamber in Westminster soon had other results. References are henceforward rarely to be found to "the king's chamber in the Tower," as compared with the many to "the king's chamber at Westminster,"¹ where most chamber work now came to be transacted. Consequent on this, further differentiation between the chamber and the privy wardrobe followed inevitably, though the cleavage was never absolute. The abolition of the chamber lands a few years later made little difference to the chamber quarters in the palace, for the new home of the chamber was a permanent one, and adequate for all the purposes for which a central office was required. Down to the end of Edward III.'s reign the king still received moneys "in his chamber at Westminster," or "in his white chamber within his palace of Westminster,"² yet as late as 1398-99, the keeper of the privy wardrobe in the Tower could still serve as receiver of the king's chamber.

Working in Westminster also gave easy opportunities to the chamber officers to exercise greater influence on parliamentary affairs. Thus, in the parliament of Hilary of 1352, it was ordered that the triers of petitions of England, besides enjoying the usual assistance of the chief ministers, should have always with them, in case any petitions were considered touching the king's chamber, either the receiver, Thomas Bramber, or the auditor, Henry Greystock, to give information on the king's behalf, or to the king.³ Similarly, in the April parliament of 1354, it was pro-

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 145, "the steward and auditors of the king's palace of Westminster."

² *I.R.* 418/1 (38 Edw. III. Easter); *ib.* 429 (41 E. III. Mich.) last membrane.

³ *Rot. Parl.* ii. 236: "Et soient totes voies present quant les dites petitions serront lues, en cas qe nulle touche la chambre le roi, sire Thomas de Brembre,

vided that Greystock was to be called in by the triers of petitions, when they were considering the petitions "touching lands and tenements reserved for the chamber."¹ Perhaps this measure indicates not so much greater concern of the chamber with parliamentary matters, as parliamentary interference with chamber business, for we must remember that the chamber estate was on the point of dissolution.² It is interesting that petitions about the chamber lands were expected, for most petitions were of the nature of complaints against an abuse, and before the next parliament, the chamber estate had disappeared.

In considering the offices and officers of the chamber, we have been compelled to touch in some ways on its functions, notably during the period of the reserved lands between 1332 and 1356. Before turning to this theme we must, however, first deal with chamber finances, since upon an adequate income depended the capacity of the chamber to extend its sphere of activity, and especially to adapt itself to be a part of the war administration during the mighty struggles with France. Moreover, it is only from the financial records of the chamber that we can get any clear view of its functions. Inevitably, then, the difficult problem of chamber finance must be grappled with, as the condition precedent to the study of its functions.

In the early years of our period an insuperable difficulty bars any real examination of chamber finance. This is due to the doctrine, loudly expressed, of its accountability only to the king, and to the claim that it was no part of the chamber's duty to preserve its accounts, still less to permit the exchequer to audit them. The first two receivers, William Trussell of Kibblestone (1333-35) and William Kilsby (1335-38), both tendered, some-

ou sire Henry de Greystok, pur doner information pur le roi et au roi quant grant bosoigne serra." It was only a coincidence that the usual meeting of these triers was in "la chambre le soutz chamberleyn pres de l'uyz de la chambre de peinte," described in 1351, for the first time, as the sub-chamberlain's room; *ib.* p. 226. In 1346 this room was called "la petite chaumbre pres del hus de la chaumbre de peinte"; *ib.* ii. 146. The sub-chamberlain was becoming a permanency, and therefore needed official quarters. Yet after 1362 the triers habitually met in "la chambre du chamberleyn pres la chambre de peinte"; *ib.* p. 268.

¹ *Rot. Parl.* ii. 254: "appelez a eux . . . aussint sire Henry de Greystok a totes les petitions qe touchent terres ou tenemenz qe sont reseruez pur la chaumbre le roi."

² See below, p. 304.

what tardily, their accounts to the auditors of the chamber.¹ So also did John Fleet, their precursor and sometime colleague, and the deputy of both Kilsby and Hatfield, his successor, tender his account in 1341 before the auditors of the chamber, for the whole time of his service from July 16, 1324, to July 1, 1341. He included in that account not only his transactions as *locum tenens* for Kilsby and Hatfield, but also his account as keeper of the privy wardrobe in the Tower, which was still regarded as a part of the chamber.² There was a tendency in these years to call all sorts of persons to account in the chamber. It was natural when, in 1337, the chamber knight, John Molyns, arrested and imprisoned in the Tower all foreign merchants, except the Bardi and the Peruzzi, and seized all their goods and jewels, that he should be called upon to answer for the same in the chamber.³ But it is strange that a household officer like Robert Howel, late clerk of the market and of the marshalsea of the household, should, in 1341, render his account for those offices in the chamber.⁴ His responsibility was to the wardrobe, and it seems usurpation for the chamber to audit the account of a wardrobe officer.

The high water mark of chamber autonomy was reached in 1344 when receiver Hatfield rendered his final account "before the king in his chamber." We are told in the writ of quittance, that "the king accepting his account, has received from him the

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 448, shows that it was not until Mar. 3, 1342, that Philip Weston and Nicholas Buckland received a commission to hear these accounts. But it was only on Aug. 28, 1345, that Trussell accounted "for the whole time when he was receiver," and was discharged under the griffin seal; *C.W.* 1337/24. Next year the king, "for his greater security," ratified this by patent at Calais; *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 476. Nevertheless the exchequer, thirty years later, was "molesting Trussell, his heirs and executors," "*contra tenorem literarum nostrarum.*" See later, p. 299. He had become a knight before June 1340; *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 479.

² *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 256. He accounted, as keeper of the Tower wardrobe and as "*locum tenens*" of Kilsby and Hatfield, for "his receipts and issues of lands of aliens and others reserved to the chamber, or prest money of exchequer and wardrobe," for "other things pertaining to such wardrobe and chamber, as also of all prests and other sums required of him at the exchequer, as has been certified into chancery" by the exchequer. He was answerable for the small balance due to the king "in the chamber and not elsewhere, in his next account." He was in office till his death in 1344, but I have found no reference to any later account. See also, for Fleet, later, pp. 445-450, 463.

³ *Ib.*, 1334-38, p. 506; *C.F.R.* v. 37. See also above, p. 89.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 610.

rolls and memoranda relating to such account, and caused them to be burnt, that they may not again come in demand," and that the king "discharges him for ever in respect thereof."¹ Mandates to this effect were sent to the exchequer, the wardrobe and the auditors of the chamber, so that the chief financial officers might know that it was useless to worry the man in whom his sovereign reposed such confidence. Nothing brings out more clearly the unique position of the chamber than this remarkable order. It is safe to say that an order to burn recent accounts could not possibly have been addressed either to the exchequer or the wardrobe. Even in the chamber this precedent was not followed. The number of surviving chamber accounts for 6-30 Edward III. show that accounts were rendered and stored. It is not likely that many of them got into the exchequer until after the changes of 1349 and 1356.

This doctrine of the irresponsibility of chamber officers to the nation has not prevented the accounts of Hatfield's successor, Burton, surviving in a fairly complete form, and did not even prevent Edward III. directing Burton to render those accounts to the exchequer.² There were good reasons for such change of attitude. The chamber lands had not yielded sufficient net revenue to enable the chamber to meet the strain of those ten years of warfare, and its pseudo independence as a financial office had seriously complicated the administrative machine. Large exchequer subventions alone had made Burton able to meet his liabilities for war expenses, and the direction to Burton to account to the exchequer was natural enough when the exchequer bore so heavy a share of his burden. This order to Burton must be studied in relation to the transfer a few months later to exchequer custody of the archives of the chamber. Both were decided steps towards that restoration of exchequer supremacy

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1343-45, p. 371.

² "Compotus Roberti de Burton, clerici, receptoris denariorum de camera regis, de quibusdam receptis et solucionibus suis diuersis hominibus, tam in cismarinis quam in transmarinis partibus factis, per breue regis de priuato sigillo directum thesaurario et baronibus, cuius datum est xxiiij^o Aprilis, anno xxiiij^o"; *Pipe*, 194/43 (23 Edw. III). Besides this enrolment, some fragments of Burton's accounts are recorded in *E.A.* 391/4 "particule compoti Roberti de Burton." In 391/4 the sum of receipt is £38,468 : 8 : 6 from Dec. 25, 1344, to Sept. 29, 1348, the same amount as in the *Pipe Roll*, for the period between Feb. 18, 1345, and Apr. 23, 1349. The payments, £39,696 : 1 : 6½, are also the same. I cannot account for this. See below, p. 291, n. 1.

in finance which marked the whole of Edington's memorable treasurership.

Edward III. had tried to make the chamber fulfil two different purposes. It was to be both an instrument of prerogative and a new war department. In time of war the second function naturally took precedence over the first. When the chamber, like the wardrobe, was pressed into the great business of fighting the French, and with this object lavished a large part of its resources in *denarii soluti extra cameram*,¹ it could only carry on with the help of grants of national money, for which it was naturally expected to account in the usual way, and to the usual authority. Thus the exchequer gradually got back its own. In his anxiety to show to sceptical parliaments that, far from absorbing their grants in court expenses,² he had spent his personal resources in the conduct of the national war, Edward grew indifferent to the strengthening of exchequer control.

The transition to more stringent exchequer control was gradual. Besides the account which Burton rendered to the exchequer, he submitted another account to the auditors of the chamber. While the exchequer account was "for the time when he was receiver of the money of our treasury in the parts beyond sea," the chamber account was "for the time when he was receiver of the king's money," that is, one imagines, for the issues of the manors and the other normal revenues of the chamber. If we can generalise from this one instance, we may say that the receivers of the chamber accounted to the king in his chamber for their expenditure of the proper chamber revenue, and accounted to the exchequer for the sums derived from national resources.³

¹ See for this *E.A.* 391/1. See above, p. 258, n. 2, and below, pp. 290, n. 1, 295, n. 3, 308, n. 2.

² Stubbs, *C.H.* ii. 595-596.

³ The evidence of Burton's twofold account is worth quoting *in extenso*. It comes from *C.W.* 1338/80, and is dated Apr. 28, 1353. It is a letter of the king to the chancellor: "Supplie nous ad nostre cher clerc, Robert de Burton, que come par son acompt, rendu en nostre chambre du temps quil estoit receuiour de noz deniers dicelle, il soit tenuz a nous en mille et quatrevingtz liures, et par un autre acompt par lui rendu en nostre eschequier, du temps quil estoit receuiour de les deniers de nostre tresorerie es parties de dela, nous lui sumes tenuz en une grendre somme qe en mesme la somme lui vousissons faire allower les mille et quatrevingtz liures auant dites et lui faire auoir paiement du remenant de meisme la somme ensi a lui du, nous, considerantz qe notre dit clerc paiast de noz mandements diuerses sommes de deniers de nostre dite chambre es parties auant dites, en les busoignes de nostre guerre, vous mandons

We have to depend upon Burton's accounts, and certain supplementary statements of some of his successors, if we would endeavour to estimate the amount of chamber transactions. We may also, with some difficulty and much labour, disinter scattered details of the financial relations between chamber and exchequer from the pipe rolls, memoranda rolls and issue rolls. Unluckily, all those sources are too incomplete to enable us to obtain more than an occasional clear glimpse, so that we have to guess at the rest. We can never feel sure that any of the surviving chamber accounts is a complete one. Burton's account is the largest that we have, but Burton had a colleague as receiver, in Thomas Bramber, who also may have tendered an account which has not been preserved. Of later receivers the records are still more fragmentary. There is the list of "issues of the chamber" between 1344 and 1355 which records payments only, made by Burton, Bramber, Mildenhall and Rothwell *extra cameram*.¹ An account of Mildenhall for 1349-50 gives us more detail.² There is special value in the long list of receipts of Mildenhall and Rothwell which the exchequer supplied to chancery at the king's request when the chamber estate was being wound up.³ But they are in no sense chamber accounts, only statements of certain obligations of chamber officers to the exchequer. We must therefore be extremely cautious in generalising from such imperfect material, especially as the figures recorded are on the meagre side.

Burton's accounts show that between 1344 and 1348 his receipts amounted to more than £38,000 for about four years. As he received over £32,000 from the wardrobe for substantially

ge, veues les certificacions ent faites, sibien hors de nostre dit eschequier come hors de nostre chambre auant dite, en nostre chancellerie a ce quest dit si troue soit par mesmes les certificacions, qe nostre dit clerc soit tenuz a nous en nostre dite chambre en mille et quatrevingt liures, et qil soit en surplusage dune greindre somme en nostre dit eschequier, qe adonques facez mander as seneschal et auditours de les accomptes de nostre dite chambre qe les mille et quatre vintz liures lun facent deschargier de tout par deuers nous en mesme la chambre, mandantz as tresorer et barons qe mesmes les mille et quatrevingtz liures furent retriere de lez surplusages auant ditz pur la cause auant dite." A difference of time may equally explain the distinction here made.

¹ *E.A.* 391/1, "Denarii soluti extra cameram regis." See above, pp. 258, 289; and below, pp. 295-309.

² *Ib.* 391/20.

³ For these see later, p. 302.

the same period,¹ it seems likely that the chamber really handled a much larger sum. A difference of less than £6000 is obviously inadequate if the chamber estate, the exchequer and the numerous miscellaneous sources of income produced any appreciable amount. Moreover, the receipts of Burton's colleague, Bramber, are not here included, nor are they recorded in any other extant documents. Probably the chamber revenue was at this time considerably in excess of £10,000 a year. Some proof that it had at least £10,000 a year is afforded by the fact that for the latter years of the reign, the chamber had a secured income from the exchequer of two-thirds of that sum, and had, besides, other supplementary resources.

Whence came the chamber income for the years 1332-55? It certainly did not come in any large measure from its landed estate. There is good evidence that these lands were singularly unproductive, and left but a scanty balance when the expenses of their administration were defrayed. Numerous as were the miscellaneous sources of revenue, they were mainly trifling in amount and casual in their incidence, a few only producing any considerable sum. One or two illustrations will best show the nature of such supplies. The king constantly received in his chamber fines and advances, made by his subjects in consideration of some favour. Sometimes an offender would purchase pardon by such a payment, as when Peter of Didcot paid £40 for a pardon for all his extortions and oppressions against the king and his tenants,² or when Thomas of Furnival paid £20 amends for his defective enclosure of the park of Worksop.³ On occasion a culprit, like Master Nicholas Heath, was kept imprisoned in the Tower, until he had paid fine to the chamber for his contempts.⁴ Serious offences involved much heavier fines, as when the prior and monks of Winchester cathedral paid 2000 marks to the chamber for electing a bishop without the royal license.⁵ If a man wished to obtain a new *inspeximus* of his charters,⁶ if he married the widow of a tenant-in-chief without leave,⁷ he com-

¹ Wetewang's wardrobe account in *E.A.* 390/12 m. 41, includes £32,129:1:8½, "in denariis allocatis Roberto de Burton, nuper receptori," etc., for the period Apr. 10, 1344, to Nov. 24, 1347. This is a shorter period than that of the two accounts quoted in n. 2, p. 288.

² *C.P.R.*, 1343-45, p. 518.

⁴ *Ib.*, 1349-54, p. 328.

⁶ *Ib.*, 1348-50, p. 212.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 121.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 541.

⁷ *Ib.*, 1345-48, p. 291.

pensated the king by a fine in the chamber. Did an abbey wish to acquire a license to hold fresh lands in mortmain,¹ or to appropriate a church to itself,² or to mitigate its burden of taxation,³ it would attain this aim by means of a chamber fine. For example, the prioress of Shaftesbury paid 100 marks to the chamber that she might get, in advance, the promise of the custody of all the abbey lands for herself and the convent, when the abbey next fell vacant.⁴ Hugh de Wychingham paid the substantial sum of £500 a year to the chamber to have the custody of the king's exchanges and mints.⁵ Whether all these fines permanently increased the king's revenue may be doubted. Very often the king was tempted by a sum of ready money to grant away the custody of valuable lands, and sometimes such a sum down was a good pretext for rewarding a necessitous dependent of the court. Even the ordinary process of leasing chamber manors at fixed rents might often result in permanent loss to the crown.

A more certain supplement to chamber resources than such fines was to be obtained by loans. Accordingly many loans were paid into the chamber from the beginning of the reign. In the early years these mainly came from the Bardi, and were sometimes of considerable amount, as for example a loan from the Bardi of £8000 early in 1331.⁶ Of course only a portion of the king's borrowings were paid into the chamber.⁷ The wardrobe and the exchequer were concurrent authorities in dealing with them, and when loans were of large amount the chamber seldom dealt with them. A loan from Paul de Montefiore of 3000 marks in 1336, and a similar loan in the same year from the Bardi⁸ were exceptional in amount. The king's borrowings in the chamber were, then, chiefly small sums advanced by his subjects,⁹ and often

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 262.

² *Ib.*, 1345-48, p. 220; *ib.*, 1348-50, p. 45.

³ *Ib.*, 1345-48, p. 358.

⁴ *Ib.*, 1345-48, p. 93; *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 190.

⁵ *Ib.*, 1354-60, p. 59.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 96. This sum was received into the king's chamber by his clerk, Richard Bury, with promise to repay the same at midsummer.

⁷ In 1331 Edward refers to the Bardi's loans as made "en nostre chambre, garderobe et aillours;" *Exch. of Rec., War. for Issues*, bu. 1, July 22, 5 Edw. III.

⁸ *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 566, *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 323, 506. In 10 Edw. III. a Bardi loan for £1000, "quas dominus rex in camera sua pro secretis negociis suis nuper recepit," was repaid by the exchequer; *I.R.* 287/13.

⁹ Examples are in *C.C.R.*, 1333-37, p. 601; *ib.*, 1343-46, p. 197; *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 468.

in consideration of some object of their own, as when the earl of Arundel, in 1351, lent the king 4000 marks "for furtherance of some business in his chamber."¹ After 1351 chamber loans become rare; though to the end, small advances from Italian bankers or merchants were sometimes² received by chamber clerks. It is another piece of evidence of change in the chamber system.

In the early years of the Hundred Years' War, large advances of wool were delivered to the king, usually beyond sea, for the expenses of his chamber, and especially during the period of Kilsby's receivership. Still earlier than this, sums were delivered in the chamber from the wardrobe "according to the course of the wardrobe."³ These, however, early ceased, and were always small. The violent means taken to replenish the chamber coffers in the early days of the war, such as, in 1337, the seizing of the goods of foreign merchants, could not be indefinitely repeated. The only way of satisfying the needs of the department was by making large drafts on the wardrobe or the exchequer. As the wardrobe itself was mainly dependent on the exchequer for supplies, the exchequer was the only real stand-by for the chamber.

A study of chamber disbursements will show that the functions of the chamber in the early part of the Hundred Years' War, were broader than those of the chamber of the Despensers. If the old chamber work went on, it is much less prominent in the accounts, which, fortunately, are fuller as regards issues than they are as regards receipts. The difference is that the chamber became largely a channel through which war expenses were paid. Not that the fundamental idea of the chamber had changed since the days of the Despensers. Payments into it were still commonly made "for the secret expenses of the king,"⁴ or "for the king's secret business." What was paid to the lord king in his chamber

¹ *Ib.*, 1350-54, p. 106.

² *M.R.K.R.* 132, com. Hil., records on Oct. 14, 1354, an advance to W. Rothwell by Benedict Zachary of £70, and on June 8, 1355, by a Flemish merchant of £17 : 8 : 4 for paying seamen's wages at Sluys.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 383, 518.

⁴ See n. 8, p. 292, above. There are many examples of the same formula, for instance in *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 59. Compare *E.A.* 391/20, "Ricardo de Norwico, clerico camere . . . de prestito super secretis expensis domini regis," an entry often repeated in this account.

was "that for which the said lord king wished no one to be charged for him."¹ Inevitably many of Edward III.'s secret, personal, or private expenses were like those of his father. Edward III. loved pomp and splendour; he was never too poor to purchase costly plate and rich jewels, so that the buying and the custody of the king's jewels were always prominent duties of chamber officers.² It was still from the chamber that the king made gifts to his personal friends or special helpers,³ or contributed liberal alms to Dominican friars and other religious persons or corporations for whom he had a personal regard.⁴ Besides such private expenses, there were the charges for the king's works, especially at Rotherhithe,⁵ where naval preparations involved considerable outlay. Naturally the cost of running the chamber, the wages, robes, and rewards of its officers and the like, were constantly recurring expenses. There was nothing novel in any of these instances, and it is useless to multiply them further. The important thing to realise is that matters such as these, which occupy the greater part of the accounts of Edward II., are quite subsidiary in the accounts of Edward III. In the later days the king's "secret business" meant much more than the personal expenses of a luxurious court, or the cost of the domestic administration. What the king had most at heart was the war with France. The secret business that he threw all his energy into was a provision of men and ships for the great war.

The preoccupation of the chamber in military and naval preparations can be illustrated in many different ways. As early as 1333 the Bardi lent money to the king's chamber for the purchase of horses, jewels, and other things for his use.⁶ In 1347 the monks of St. Mary's, York, paid money into the chamber "for the expenses of the war with France."⁷ In 1339 wool was taken beyond sea to the king for the expenses of his chamber.⁸ In the same way the store-house of the chamber, the privy wardrobe in the Tower, became nothing more than an armoury.

¹ *Brantingham Roll* passim copiously illustrates this frequent formula.

² For example, *E.A.* 392/19, indentures of William of Lambeth as to receipt of plate and jewels.

³ For example, 100s. to Robert de Thorp "seruiens regis in lege" for his annual fee and labour in the king's business.

⁴ *Ib.* 391/20.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 455.

⁶ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 74.

⁷ *Ib.* 391/20, cf. *ib.* 540/27.

⁸ *Ib.*, 1345-48, p. 262.

The most typical chamber accounts of the period are almost entirely taken up with military and naval expenditure.

Burton's chamber accounts are particularly instructive in this relation, for he accounted for receipts and payments made both in England and abroad.¹ Nine-tenths of his expenses are advances to the keeper of the wardrobe and others, to meet the expenses of the war. Many advances were made to the dukes, counts and knights of the Netherlands and Germany "for their homage and retinue"; others went to help Thomas Dagworth to carry on the campaign in Brittany; others to barons and knights of England for their wages and fees; others to cross-bowmen for working their *balistae*; others for the purchase of armour; a few for diplomatic missions, and some to pay debts to foreign princes. It is not too much to say that, so far as Burton's work went, he was just a channel for war expenses.² The same story is told by the even more instructive book of chamber issues *extra cameram*, which covers not only Burton's period but also the succeeding years up to 1355.³ The great mass of these payments are for ships and mariners, for armour and armourers, though they are curiously intermingled with the expenses of the works at the king's manors of Rotherhithe and Henley in Surrey, the wages of *camera* officers and occasional personal expenses of the king.⁴ It is true that this book is professedly a list of payments *extra cameram* and that Burton's account also is to a considerable extent one of payments outside the chamber. The interesting point, however, is that the receivers of the chamber should go outside their proper function and make these large subventions to the cost of carrying on the war. Their archives, for that reason, give us some of our earliest information as to the employment of firearms and gunpowder in this

¹ "Tam in cismarinis quam in transmarinis partibus"; *E.A.* 391/4.

² *Pipe*, 194/43, 23 Edw. III. cf. *E.A.* 391/4. The "denarii soluti extra cameram" were largely for ships and armour.

³ *E.A.* 391/1. The old title is simply "prestita regis Edwardi tercii." The modern endorsement is "issues from the king's chamber, 18-20 Edw. III." It begins "denarii soluti extra cameram regis diuersis de prestitis ad respondendum inde." See also above, pp. 258, 289, 290, and later, p. 309, and pp. 452, 453-455.

⁴ Interesting items include "Thome de Roldeston . . . super factura pulueris pro ingeniis et emendacione diuersarum armaturarum, xls." This entry was apparently at the end of March or April 1346 (f. 1), "Egidio Melyn, lorinier, super factura unius ymaginis de cupro ad similitudinem unius regis."

country.¹ The chamber, like the wardrobe, was pressed into the great business of fighting the French. In the process it lost some of its most distinctive features, for a branch of the national war machine could be no mere office of the court.

The special position enjoyed by the chamber between 1333 and 1356 provoked hardly a murmur of remonstrance from the nation. Though in 1327 the system of reserved lands had been abolished at the instance of the commons, we find no evidence that the chamber system was disliked by the parliaments of Edward III.² It looks rather as if the commons regarded the king's chamber as favourably as did the commons under Henry IV., because it afforded a means for the king to realise the popular ideal of "living of his own."³

As far as is known, no advantage was taken of the special arrangements we have mentioned for hearing chamber petitions. Nor is there any evidence that the inhabitants of chamber estates objected to chamber jurisdiction. The royal interest in their doings might well, upon occasion, be a blessing in disguise, for anything done to their prejudice by hostile neighbours was at once stopped as infringing on the king's rights. Thus, the king's powerful protection saved his Burstwick tenants from the damage wrought on them by a neighbouring landholder,⁴ protected their lands from inundation, by improving the water courses, and liberally dispensed manumissions to the bond tenants

¹ See "Fire Arms in England in the Fourteenth Century" by the present writer in *E.H.R.* xxvi. 666-702.

² In 1353 the commons petitioned against "trop grevous fyns et amercementz de eux priz, si bien par Monsieur Johan de Molyns come par autres, par especiales commissions usees en autre manere que la lei commune ne demande"; *Rot. Parl.* ii. 253. The king answered that all who wished to complain of Molyns, or anyone else assigned to such a commission, had liberty to do so, and that if they were proved to have offended, redress should be made. The mention of Molyns suggests that this may be a veiled complaint against chamber officers, but any misdeeds of Molyns' as the king's chamber minister must have been committed more than twelve years before 1353. See for Molyns' general career, iii. 98, 112, 123; and pp. 243-244 above. *E.A.* 392/6 shows, however, that Molyns was extensively employed in 1351-53 by queen Philippa. Part of his fees and robes were as steward of her lands south of Trent and "pro gubernacione camere regine." The queen, though advising her husband to allow the account, protested that her cofferer had acted "sanz sceu ou comandement de nous"; *ib.* 392/10.

³ *Rot. Parl.* iii. 625, a petition of 11 Henry IV. against the alienation of royal possessions, "sy ne soit al profit et oeps nostre dit seignour le roi pur la sustenance de son hostiell, chambre et garderobe."

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, pp. 173-174; compare *ib.* pp. 171-173.

in return for fines of fixed amount.¹ Another instance of beneficial royal interest in their affairs was when Edward declared unjust the custom of the manor of Bond Burstwick by which strangers, on payment of a fine to the bailiffs, could enter upon bondsmen's lands to the exclusion of their issue.² Nor was Holderness exclusively privileged in its direct access to the throne. The inhabitants of Brill in Buckinghamshire, a manor of ancient demesne reserved to the chamber, obtained similar protection from the extortions of the steward of queen Philippa;³ and the chamber justice saved men of Wight from leaving their island defenceless to plead in the courts of the mainland.⁴

The only strong opposition to the chamber came from the departmental jealousies of the exchequer. It is abundantly clear that the exchequer resented the setting up, by Edward III., of the chamber as a rival financial organisation outside its control. When the chamber of the Despensers was broken up, the exchequer, as we have seen, was the instrument both of its destruction and of the tardy account of its fallen officers. Then the exchequer entered into the inheritance of the chamber, and its officers found it hard to hold their hands when receivers, stewards, and auditors of the chamber again exercised an independent jurisdiction. The close rolls, for this period, contain innumerable instances of royal writs warning off the treasurer and barons of the exchequer from attempting to tamper with the privileges of the chamber. It was a practice of the exchequer to call upon persons, who had duly rendered their

¹ *Foedera*, ii. 1038; *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 66; *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 25. £15 was required for manumission of a bondsman "cum sequela sua."

² *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, pp. 518-519; Edward on Sept. 1, 1337, cancelled Molyns' order to the contrary effect on the petition of the bondsmen of Bond Burstwick, as the king thought the custom unjust, and believed that bondsmen's issue ought to succeed, if willing to make fine for their lands. This may be a protection of the bondsmen from a characteristic piece of greediness on Molyns' part. But it suggests that the direct access to the throne, enjoyed even by the serfs on chamber manors, made for mildness of chamber administration. The manor of Burstwick might well be worth investigation. Among its members Bond Burstwick is specially interesting. Another, Hedon, had some sort of burghal privileges, and its inhabitants were called "the king's burgesses of Hedon"; *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 66. This seems a further confirmation of Prof. Tait's doctrine of the vagueness of the mediaeval conception of a borough; *British Borough Charters, 1216-1301*, pp. xlviii *et seq.* Hedon, not even a manor, was still a sort of borough. Compare *ib.* pp. xx-xxi, as regards Kingston-on-Thames. The burgesses of Hedon are not known to Prof. Tait.

³ *C.W.* 1337/5 and 6.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1341-43, p. 518.

accounts in the chamber, to produce them again before the exchequer, and sometimes repeated prohibitions were required to protect such persons from molestation. Time after time, the exchequer endeavoured to appropriate the issues of chamber manors, and, time after time, long lists of such manors were sent to the exchequer, that the treasurer and barons should have no excuse of ignorance for thus interfering with them.¹ On other occasions the exchequer wished to take possession of forfeited estates, until writs of chancery ordered it to permit the ministers of the chamber to dispose of them in accordance with the king's reservation.²

Sometimes the sheriffs and other local officers aided the exchequer in these attacks on the chamber system, as when in 1344 the sheriff of Hampshire strove to compel the alien prior of Appledurcombe in the Isle of Wight to pay at the exchequer the ferm he had agreed to render in the chamber for the custody of his priory. The sheriff had fortified himself with an exchequer writ and the "pretext of an extract of chancery"; but a letter close sternly bade him desist. The ferm was due to the chamber, and to the chamber alone must it be paid.³ So late as 1350, a royal writ was necessary to save Robert Mildenhall from being called upon to answer at the exchequer for a fine

¹ Nearly all the information, derived from the close rolls and patent rolls, as to the nature of the chamber reservations, comes from the repeated prohibitions to the exchequer against meddling with chamber business as, for example; *C.C.R.*, 1343-46, pp. 303-304. A strong, but characteristic, rebuke to the exchequer for interfering with the management of the alien priories of Holderness and Wight, assigned to the chamber, is in *M.R.K.R.* 116 (14 Edw. III. Easter t.), under date of Mar. 30, 1340. "Edwardus, etc. Come nous eons einz ces heures reserue a nostre chambre la ferme des priories aliens en lisle de Wyght, el countee de Suthampton, et del priorie de Brustal, en Holdernesse el countee Deverwyk, et sur ceo auons entenduz que vous auetz fait assignementz desdites priores, nient eiant regard a nostre reseruacion, dont nous vous tenons mal paieiz; vous mandons que desore ne facetz nul assignement des dites priories ne ne nous medlez de rien de terres ne des priories qe nous auons issi reseruez deuers nostre chambre. Et si vous eiez nul assignement, fait del terme de Pasche proschein auenir, voloms qil soit hastiement repelle. Done souz nostre priue seal a Westmouster, le xxx jour de Marz, lan de nostre regne, Dengleterre quatorszime et de France primer." Compare *ib.* *K.R.* 123, breu. dir. bar. (21 Edward III. Trin. t.), "quia manerium nostrum de Yeshamstede camere nostre reseruauimus, et de exitibus eiusdem de cetero in dictam cameram nostram volumus responderi, vobis mandamus quod de eodem manerio extunc nullatenus intromittatis" (July 1).

² *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, p. 187, an order of 1347 not to intermeddle with the forfeited estates of the rebel, Adam of Peshale.

³ *Ib.*, 1343-46, p. 290

from an abbot for which he had already accounted in the chamber.¹

Sometimes chamber accountants found that it was to their interest to transfer their accountability from chamber to exchequer, as the widow of Simon Grimsby did, until a royal prohibition prevented her from carrying out her intentions.² It occasionally happened that the exchequer persecuted chamber officers for many years after they had ceased to act. Thirty years after William Trussell had been discharged by the auditors of his chamber accounts, his executors and heirs were still being "molested" by the exchequer in defiance of the royal letters.³ Robert Burton, who had long ceased to be receiver, had to be protected in 1360 by a royal mandate to the exchequer to stay its demands on him for sums still claimed from him in this capacity.⁴ The exchequer constantly threw difficulties in the way of the chamber by questioning the validity or sufficiency of letters under the griffin seal, and had frequently to be told that letters of the griffin seal were a sufficient warranty.⁵

The perpetual bickerings between the exchequer and the chamber were the more troublesome, as there was constant need for co-operation between the two departments. Sometimes the custody of the estates of a ward was shared between guardians responsible to the chamber, and guardians who accounted at the exchequer.⁶ Sometimes it was necessary for the exchequer and the chamber to join together in the common acknowledgment of a payment or debt.⁷ Or again, the exchequer collected chamber dues itself and paid them into the chamber. We have seen that the abbot of Cluni's ferm was dealt with in this way. On occasion also, the greater coercive powers of the exchequer were, as in 1348-1349, put at the disposal of the chamber.⁸ The hostility of exchequer to chamber would be more respectable if we could identify it with such principles as national control over court expenses, or

¹ *M.R.K.R.* 127, breu. dir. bar. Mich. t. 25 Edw. III.

² See above, pp. 273, 283.

³ See the mandate of Oct. 29, 1375, in *M.R.K.R.* 152, breu. dir. bar. Easter t. 50 Edw. III. m. 5d.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 150, cf. 255. There were earlier writs, postponing similar demands on Burton, in *ib.*, 1354-60, pp. 391, 666.

⁵ *Ib.*, 1341-43, pp. 28, 215, 331.

⁶ This was the case with the lands of Roger Mortimer; *ib.*, 1346-49, p. 199.

⁷ *Ib.*, 1349-54, p. 138.

⁸ See above, pp. 281-285.

the unity of the king's financial system. But it would be idle to imagine that fourteenth century officials based their action on such general grounds as these. Nevertheless, we must recognise that the claims of the exchequer over the chamber did ultimately mean little less than this. No doubt the exchequer officers were inspired by that departmental jealousy, which, in our times as in the fourteenth century, so often sets up public bodies in ridiculous antagonism to each other. They were, perhaps, also moved by the natural wish of all government offices in all ages to get as much power into their hands as possible. Brought up in the rigid traditions of the most ancient department of state, they naturally disliked the easy-going methods of the chamber, and, in resisting them, they were in some measure fighting the nation's battles as well as their own. Reward came in their half victory of 1349, by which the supremacy of the exchequer was substantially obtained. They enjoyed the full fruits of that supremacy when the chamber's landed estate was given up in 1356.

The death knell of the chamber lands had been already sounded in the changes which followed, in 1348-49, the death of Buckland and the retirement of Philip Weston. As a result of them, Henry Greystock became the autocrat of a chamber, perhaps even then a little restricted in its scope, coexisting with the exchequer, yet subordinated to it. Greystock's appointment to this quasi-monarchical position is contained in a patent dated May 11, 1349, which superseded and amplified his previous appointment.¹ He was "to survey the lands reserved to the king's chamber and dispose of these as shall be best for the king's honour and profit, as well as to audit the accounts . . . of all ministers of the chamber who have to render account." A new wage of £50 a year, to be paid "out of the money in the chamber," was assigned to him.² Not only was Greystock called steward of the lands of the chamber, but indifferently also their surveyor, auditor, administrator and disposer.³ To survey and audit were the ordinary charges; even the injunction to "dispose of" chamber lands was no novelty, but obviously some

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 293; see also above, pp. 269, 284.

² It was paid by Mildenhall; *E.A.* 391/20.

³ "Steward of the chamber," *C. Ancient Deeds*, i. A. 1430; "superuisor et dispositor terrarum et denariorum camere regis," *E.A.* 391/20; "senescallus et auditor," *ib.* 392/18; "surveyor and administrator," *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 38.

deeper significance was now attached to the usual phrases. The chancery writ of May 11 was warranted by a writ under the griffin seal, dated the same day and place, but containing a preamble, assigning reasons for the step, which the chancery suppressed, doubtless as irrelevant to the new appointment.¹ This preamble stated that, having regard to the small number of lands reserved to the chamber, the large proportion of these now leased out on farm, and the heavy charge for the wages and fees of the ministers of the chamber,² the king had, by advice of his council, ordered the general cancellation of the commissions of the auditors, the receivers of the chamber, and also of the local stewards and receivers in Holderness, Wight and elsewhere.³ In their place the king appointed his dear clerk, Henry of Greystock, who had knowledge of these lands, to survey them and to dispose of them in such a way as should seem to him most to the honour and profit of the crown, and to hear the accounts of all the ministers of the chamber.⁴

This preamble made clear the importance of the step thus taken. The expensive chamber game was not, in the opinion of king and council, worth the candle it cost. The wisest of the chamber ministers was accordingly appointed to take stock of the situation and devise a remedy. The liberal wage assigned to Greystock was thus easily explained. The only satisfactory remedy was the abolition of the chamber lands, and the wonder is that it took Greystock six years to come to that conclusion. It is, however, important to grasp that the initiative lay with the administration itself, and that the chief chamber officer was the agent in burying decently a system he was unable to keep alive.

To compensate the chamber for declining independence and

¹ I examined the Patent Roll, 227/8 (23 Edw. III. pt. i.), and ascertained that the suppression was made in the enrolment and not only by the calendar.

² *C.W.* 1337/75, "Come nouz, eantz regard si bien a la petite quantite des terres reservez a nostre chambre, . . . come a la grante charge des gages et feods des ministres de la dite chambre."

³ *Ib.* "Eons ordenez . . . qe noz auditours des accomptes et resceyuours des deniers de la dite chambre, et ce aussibiens noz seneschals et resceyuours en Holdernesse et en lisle de Wight come autres queconqs, soient oustes et noz commissions en a eux faites repellez."

⁴ *Ib.* "Et eons assignez nostre cher clerc, Henry de Greystock, qi ad connoissance de celles terres a surueer les, et dycelles ordener solom ce qil verra qi plues soit a nostre honour et profit, et oier les accomtes de touz nos ministres de nostre dite chambre."

receipts, exchequer advances, always considerable, were now made with increasing freedom "in ease of our chamber."¹ The financial relations between the last chamber receivers and the exchequer were close and constant. This was fully revealed when in 1356 the exchequer certified its advances to keepers Mildenhall and Rothwell, for which the latter had accepted responsibility. Between June 1353 and November 1354 Rothwell charged himself in his account rendered in the chamber with nearly £3000, "from our great treasury," that is, of course, the exchequer, "for the expenses of our chamber."² Later, on February 25, 1356, the exchequer certified that Rothwell was responsible to it for more than £9570, advanced at various times between 1353 and 1356.³

Other reversions to former habits show that the activities of the chamber were being slowly curtailed. The relations between wardrobe and chamber in these years are almost too complicated to be intelligible. But we may see some significance in numerous instances of definitely chamber work now being assigned to the wardrobe in a fashion for which there were few precedents since Edward III.'s minority. Thus, in 1348, it is recorded that the fines and ransoms, paid by the shipmasters whose vessels withdrew without license from the fleet in Brittany, were divided between the wardrobe and the chamber.⁴ Persons anxious to receive the custody of royal wards, or to buy off the royal displeasure for marrying without license, or seeking to marry

¹ Thus, in 1353, an allowance, due from the chamber seven years before, was directed to be paid "*en ease de la chambre hors de nostre grante tresorie*"; *E.A.* 391/8.

² *M.R.K.R.* 131/22, *breu. dir. bar. Mich. t. 29 Ed. III.*, "*se ad charge en son accompt rendu en meisme la chambre de . . . receuz de nostre grande tresorie . . . sur les despenses de nostre dite chambre.*" This is a writ of griffin seal of Nov. 15, 1354, addressed to the exchequer.

³ *Ib.* 132, *com. Hilar. Essex*, gives (1) the chancery mandate to the exchequer of Jan. 26, 1356; (2) two schedules or rolls returned by exchequer to chancery, dated Feb. 25, specifying Rothwell's "debts" in detail. The first roll mentions debts, amounting to £1255, incurred in 28 and 29 E. III. The second roll details Rothwell's "receipt" from the exchequer between June 6, 1353, and July 24, 1355, amounting to £8255:17:9. The whole "onus" of Rothwell then was £9510:17:9. The items on the second roll include a tally for £1000 in the name of the collectors of customs and subsidies of London, and £1074 in money by the hands of Matthew Torksey, keeper of the king's ships, "*super empcione cuiusdam magne navis cum xiv mastis ad opus regis, per breue de liberate.*" Novel expenses loom largely in this account. It shows that the exchequer rolls and memoranda were well ordered, when in a month, it could produce so careful a statement: "*scrutatis rotulis et memorandis ad scaccarium compotorum.*"

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 72.

heiresses in the king's keeping, or to hold the temporalities of vacant churches, paid into the wardrobe the sums necessary to secure the royal permission.¹ Moreover, we have already examined the matter of the development of the system of assignments of wardships to the wardrobe "for the expenses of the king's household."² Nothing in such facts alone necessarily foreshadowed the impending change, for clashing jurisdictions were never resented by the mediaeval mind. Nevertheless, in the light of what happened later, these facts are worth recording. The tentative erection of the wardrobe in the place of the chamber reminds us of the compromise of "wardrobe manors" in 1312.³ But what, under Edward II., marked the beginning of a new period of chamber activity was, under his son, the sign that the reservation of lands to the chamber was about to collapse.

We have now followed up the various converging lines which bring us to the chamber revolution of 1355-56. A series of experiments heralded the final abolition of the chamber lands, and by this time they had been tried long enough to give them a chance. It was now that the line of clerical receivers came to an end with Rothwell and Norwich. The stewards and auditors of the chamber passed out of the records and the griffin seal fell into disuse. In 1349 the chamber's administrative autonomy had disappeared with the transfer of its archives to exchequer custody, and the imposition of a certain measure of exchequer control. The thin pretence of economic independence disappeared in 1354 when an annual subvention of 5000 marks was assigned for its expenses.⁴ Meanwhile chamber lands were rapidly being restored to exchequer direction, until nothing survived of them except the stationary chamber office at Westminster, whose proximity to the exchequer symbolised the chamber's subjection to that department. The undermining of the system, on which Greystock had been engaged since 1349, was consummated by the final act of 1356.

¹ *Ib.*, 1348-50, pp. 416, 431, 466, 471, 489; *ib.*, 1350-54, pp. 41, 105, 197, 199, 210. The earliest instance of a payment into the wardrobe for the custody of temporalities of a church was on Feb. 1, 1357, when the king granted to John Wesenham the temporalities of Ely for one year, on his rendering 3740 marks to the king in his wardrobe; *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 392.

² See above, pp. 122-129; and *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, pp. 51, 581; *ib.*, 1349-54, pp. 31, 32, 105.

³ See above, ii. 322-323.

⁴ See for this later, pp. 313-314

The reasons for the abolition of the chamber estate were that it had failed to discharge its purpose and that the special organisation for its management had done nothing to help forward the administration of the state in war-time but had simply added to the complication of an already over-elaborated machine. Not only was the chamber in conflict with the exchequer. It overlapped the wardrobe, and was intimately bound up with the privy wardrobe and the great wardrobe. But, behind all such considerations, lay the cardinal fact that the increasing dependence of Edward III. on parliament and the nation, by reason of the financial embarrassments caused by his French campaigns, made a strong self-supporting court office no longer practicable.

It would be interesting to know whether the king and his ministers were consciously actuated by such considerations as this last. Unluckily, though the records give us in detail the process of the change, they do but faintly reflect the motives of those who made it. The chamber's release of its lands attracted little contemporary notice. Both the chroniclers and the rolls of parliament are silent about the matter, though the fact that, on the eve of the change, special provision was made for petitions touching chamber lands and chamber concerns generally, suggests that chamber affairs were exciting some public attention.¹ Administrative procedure was still a mystery to the man in the street, who was only interested in it when it touched his pocket. It is almost useless, then, to look for documentary evidence of the underlying causes. Failing that, if any individual can be regarded as the author of the abolition of the chamber estate, I am inclined to suggest treasurer Edington. He had been treasurer since 1344; he exercised great influence over the king, and he had made his power felt already in many directions. Of the general scope of his work enough has been said earlier.² His policy of reconciliation between king and nobles, between the household and the offices of state, might well have led him to persuade Edward to make the abolition of the chamber lands the crowning achievement of his twelve years' treasurership. His elevation to the chancery and the bishopric of Winchester within a few months of this,

¹ See above, pp. 285-286.

² See above, iii. 202-205.

might, then, be regarded as the appropriate reward of his services.¹ Of course this suggestion is the merest guesswork, but until clearer evidence arises, it may well be put forward as, at least, a plausible hypothesis to explain the facts.

However this may be, it was under Edington's guidance that the fate of the chamber lands was now finally settled. The hands were the hands of Greystock, but the direction came from Thoresby the chancellor and Edington the treasurer. The decisive step was taken by a royal writ,² addressed to Edington and the barons of the exchequer, dated January 20, 1356. By this the king ordered that all lands, tenements and other things, which had been previously reserved to the king's chamber should be reunited to the king's exchequer. The only exception to that order was the estate granted for life to Isabella, the king's eldest daughter.³

¹ The juxtaposition of dates may have significance. The writ abolishing the chamber lands was issued on Jan. 20, 1356. Edington was elected bishop on May 14 and made chancellor on Nov. 27 of the same year.

² The substance of this writ is given in *Pipe*, 209/47 (38 Edw. III.) under the heading of the "Compotus W. de Clewer, clerici nauium regis." It is written out at length in *M.R.K.R.* 132, breu. dir. bar., Hilary t. 30 Edward III., and again in the same roll in the comm. (recorda) for the same term, along with the other crucial documents relative to the dissolution of the chamber lands. Its importance warrants its transcription in full, "Pro rege. Rex thesaurario et baronibus suis de scaccario, salutem. Quia volumus quod omnia terre et tenementa et alie res quecumque, ante hec tempora camere nostre reseruata, exceptis terris et tenementis Isabelle, einicie filie nostre, ad terminum vite sue habendis, per nos datis et concessis, scaccario predicto reiuungantur, et quod omnia compota eandem cameram tangencia, que nondum sunt reddita nec determinata, in scaccario predicto audiantur et terminantur, et quod omnes pecuniarum summe in dictam cameram nobis debite ad opus nostrum in eodem scaccario leuentur, et per breue nostrum mandauimus senescallo et auditoribus compotorum camere nostre predictae quod omnes rotulos compotorum et alia memoranda cameram predictam tangencia que in custodia sua existunt, ac nomina illorum qui compota et arreragia, siue alia debita in cameram predictam reddere seu soluere tenentur, vobis liberent ad execucionem inde in scaccario predicto faciendam, vobis mandamus quod rotulos et memoranda predicta a prefatis senescallo et auditoribus recipiatis, et execucionem ulterius inde fieri faciatis, prout de iure fuerit faciendum : volumus enim quod compota in camera predicta reddita et alia negocia ibidem determinata in suo robore permaneant et effectu. Teste me ipso, apud Westmonasterium, xx^o die Januarii anno regni nostri Anglie xxix^o, regni vero Francie sextodecimo." The marginal heading in the communia entry is : "Anglia." "De memorandis cameram regis tangentibus recipiendis et execucione inde facienda."

³ Among these lands were Burstwick and the Isle of Wight. Isabella, who subsequently became lady of Coucy and countess of Bedford, still held Burstwick in 1361; *C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 194. The effect of limitation may have been to make Burstwick and Isabella's other lands a franchise, like that which her grandmother, queen Isabella, had enjoyed before 1330.

Besides this, the king ordered that all accounts touching the king's chamber, which had not been rendered in the exchequer, should be heard there, and that all sums of money, owed to the chamber, should be levied in the exchequer. A corresponding writ to the steward and auditor of the chamber was met by prompt obedience. On January 27 Greystock appeared in the exchequer and surrendered his account-books, memoranda and records.¹

Thus the change was effected. From January 20, Greystock was *nuper senescallus et auditor*, but it took several years and a great deal of hard work on the part of the exchequer officers to wind up the various arrears that gradually dribbled in to Westminster.² To facilitate the process, or to reward the readiness of his surrender, Henry Greystock was appointed, on October 6, baron of the exchequer and admitted to his office on that very

¹ The process is recorded in the continuation of the communia entry of memoranda roll (*K.R.* 132) already quoted. "Et modo a die sancti Hillarii in xv dies, hoc termino, venit hic Henricus de Greystoke, nuper senescallus et auditor compotorum dicte camere, et exhibuit curie quoddam breue regis cuius tenor talis est: Edwardus, etc., senescallo et auditoribus compotorum dicte camere salutem. Quia volumus quod omnes terre et tenementa ac alie res quecumque, ante hec tempora dicte camere nostre reservata, exceptis terris et tenementis Isabella, einecie filie nostre, ad terminum vite sue habendis per nos datis et concessis, scaccario nostro reungantur, et quod omnia compota eandem cameram tangentia, que nondum sunt reddita nec determinata, in scaccario predicto audiantur et terminentur, et quod omnes pecuniarum summe in dictam cameram nobis debite, ad opus nostrum in eodem scaccario leuentur, vobis mandamus quod omnes rotulos compotorum et alia memoranda cameram predictam tangentia que in custodia vestra existunt, ac nomina illorum qui compota et arreragia siue alia debita in cameram nostram predictam reddere, seu soluere tenentur, thesaurario et baronibus de scaccario predicto liberetis, ad execucionem inde in eodem scaccario faciendam. Mandauimus enim prefatis thesaurario et baronibus quod rotulos et memoranda predicta a vobis recipiant et execucionem inde fieri faciant in forma predicta. Teste me ipso, apud Westminster, xx^o die Januarii, anno regni nostri Anglie vicesimo nono, regni vero nostri Francie sexto decimo. Cuius breuis pretextu idem Henricus ad eandem quindenam sancti Hillarii liberauit hic rotulos compotorum diuersorum custodum et balliuorum de terris et maneriis ad dictam cameram spectantibus, et eidem camere reservatis, in eadem camera redditorum, ac etiam diuersas extentas de eisdem terris et maneriis et quedam diuersa alia memoranda easdem terras et maneria tangentia ab anno sexto regis nunc, videlicet." A list of the accounts, lands, rents, extents and arrears, follows. The whole record covers five closely written membranes of the roll and affords material for a minute study of the activities of Edward III.'s chamber in regard to these lands, from the inception to the abolition of the estate.

² *M.R.K.R.* 132, breu. return., Hilary, contains the enrolment of a large number of writs of "venire facias" sent to the various sheriffs, instructing them to see that all arrears of accounts, previously rendered to the chamber, were presented to the exchequer as quickly as possible. The enrolment covers the greater part of three membranes.

day.¹ Besides Greystock, there were other chamber officers who now brought their accounts before the exchequer. We have seen already that Rothwell's accounts occupied much of the time and attention of the exchequer and chancery. Rothwell died before he received a full acquittance and his final account "for the lands, tenements and whatsoever things were recently reserved to the chamber," was presented to the exchequer by his executors, only appearing in the pipe roll for 1360-61. Though the account, as it survives, is a privy wardrobe account, and the chamber is not mentioned in it, the description of its scope compels us to speak of it here.² There is nothing said as to Norwich having any accounts. In the certificates of Rothwell's *onus* at the exchequer, Norwich only appears as a chamber clerk through whose hands Rothwell received a large proportion of his exchequer advances. Norwich, apparently, was not an accounting officer, and the inference seems to be that the dual receivership was already at an end. The accounts of Mildenhall, who had gone out of office in 1353, were also brought under exchequer inspection, but only for certain small items, as he had clearly been acquitted of his larger obligations at an earlier date, before exchequer control had become so rigorous, though he did not receive his final quittance until 1357.³

Among the more strictly departmental accountants may be mentioned William Clewer, clerk of the king's ships, whose final account for his receipts from chamber receivers dragged over

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1354-58, p. 438. He was still acting as baron in 1362 (*C.C.R.*, 1360-64, pp. 308-309) and so trusted by the council that he was added, in 1361, to a committee of the commons appointed to audit a war subsidy account that the exchequer was forbidden to meddle with; *ib.*, 1364-68, pp. 119-120. Foss's account of Greystock (*Judges of England*, p. 314) makes his career begin in 1299, so that in 1362 he would have been 63 years in the king's service. I suspect Foss has confused him with another person of the same name, and that the widow Jane, assigned to this veteran king's clerk, is another mistake. Anyhow it is unlikely that this ancient dame should, after Greystock's death, have married Sir William Gascoigne, made chief justice in 1400, as his second wife, and borne children to him.

² *Pipe* 206/53 (35 E. III.). See also *M.R.K.R.* 131, breu. dir. bar. Mich. (Nov.); 132, com. (rec.) Hil. t. (Feb. 28). *Pipe*, 200 (London' Midd'), North'; Item Essex; Item London' Midd' (second membrane).

³ *Ib.* 202/m. 2d; Item Essex, Nova oblata (31 E. III.). See also *M.R.K.R.* 122, breu. dir. bar. Trin. t. (June 12); 132, breu. dir. bar. Hil. t.; 135, breu. dir. bar. Mich. t.; *Pipe*, 200 (Item London' Midd'); 202 (Item Essex, Hertford').

many years, and ultimately appeared in the pipe roll of 1364.¹ An even more belated accountant was Robert Burton, who had ceased to be receiver in 1349, but whose book of issues was only delivered to the exchequer by Greystock on February 15, 1362.² Another was John of Cologne, the king's armourer, whose long account from 1333 to 1354 was tendered after his death by his nephew and heir in 1361.³ Of smaller accounts there were those of Thomas Cary, "recently porter of the chamber" for the purchase of hemp for cables and cords for some of the king's ships, presented after his death by Alice, his widow and executor,⁴ and the much-belated account of Thomas of Snetesham, recently clerk of the ships and barges of the king, for arms, armour and "artillery" (this latter not necessarily fire-arms) supplied to certain ships, all of which went back to dates earlier than 1352.⁵ To these must be added the accounts of Robert Hadham, sometime escheator of the chamber, which have been mentioned in an earlier connection.⁶

More important than these various accounts was the sheaf of documents which Henry Greystock, "recently steward of the king's chamber, and auditor of accounts of the same chamber," delivered into the exchequer in 1356 and 1357.⁷ Drawn up, doubtless, with the practical object of helping the exchequer

¹ *Pipe*, 209/47, 38 E. III. It extends from 1344 to 1358, but he ceased to receive chamber advances after 1354. Before him Nicholas Pike accounted, as keeper of the king's ships, in the chamber before steward and auditors; *E.A.* 391/8. Was Matthew Torksey, also clerk of the king's ships and often mentioned as receiving by his hands moneys for which Rothwell was to account in the chamber, not an accountant? His case seems similar to that of Norwich and may suggest that one accounting officer had recently become the rule in each branch of the chamber.

² *E.A.* 391/1. This extends to 1355 and was delivered, by Greystock, to the exchequer in 1362; see above, pp. 258, n. 2, 289, n. 1, 290, n. 1, 295, n. 3; and also p. 288, n. 2.

³ *Pipe* 207/51 (36 Edw. III.). Most of his receipts were from the chamber.

⁴ *Ib.* m. 52d. His receipts were also from the chamber.

⁵ *Ib.* 209/40 (38 Edw. III.).

⁶ *Ib.* 204/43d (33 Edw. III.). See also above, pp. 275-276.

⁷ *E.A.* 392/18, consists of several documents relating to the closing of the account for the chamber lands. The most important are (a) "arreragia firmarum in cameram regis debitarum per euidencias et memoranda eiusdem camere, viii die Marci anno xxx^c regis Edwardi," and (b) "certificacio Henrici de Graistok, nuper senescalli camere regis et auditoris compotorum eiusdem camere, de quibusdam compotis regi debitis in cameram predictam, et ibidem nondum redditus." The dates of delivery of the items at the exchequer are noted on the dorse and vary between March 1356 and May 1357.

to take over the administration of the chamber lands, these schedules afford us evidence that down to the very end of the period of reservation, the number of chamber lands was still not inconsiderable. Among the keepers of forfeited estates, or of estates of wards, were the keepers of the lands of William de Ros of Helmsley, the keepers of the lands of William de Coucy, of Anketin de Houby "recently hanged" and of John of St. Philibert. Among lands long reserved for the chamber Hampstead Marshall, Speen and Easthampstead, Berks., the castle and manor of Somerton, Lincs., the manor of Henley in Surrey, Corsham, Wilts., and lands in Holderness are mentioned. The priors of three alien priories in the Isle of Wight were still accounting in the chamber, and many fines and other payments were in arrears. Greystock submitted his first schedule on March 10, 1356. Two others of smaller size, one of which was delivered on May 8, 1357, do not add materially to our information.

The process of transfer was slow. Hadham did not surrender all his escheats to the local escheators until 1360.¹ It was a long time before the keepers of chamber fees had all similarly handed over their charge to the escheators responsible to the exchequer. This is well illustrated by the account of John Stoke, keeper of the fees reserved to the king's chamber in Worcestershire, Shropshire and Herefordshire. This local bailiff was appointed on October 13, 1349. Up to April 30, 1354, his accounts were exclusively rendered to the chamber, though he rendered no account at all for his Worcestershire lands, and his Shropshire accounts were only partial. We may suspect John's dilatoriness was characteristic of his class, though his arrears do not seem to be included in Greystock's schedule of arrears already referred to, perhaps because of the insignificance of their amount. For these arrears and for the rest of his account, John accounted at the exchequer. But he continued, like Hadham, to account separately for his old charge, and it was only gradually that it was handed over to the normal escheators of the counties in which it had been embedded. Thus, on October 2, 1359, he ceased to account for Herefordshire, and on that day delivered

¹ *C.F.R.* vii. 127. See also *Pipe*, 207/44 (36 Edw. III.), and 201/40 (36 Edw. III.). In 1365 Hadham himself became escheator of Gloucester, Hereford, and the adjacent March "to answer at the exchequer"; *ib.* p. 305.

his Herefordshire fees to the escheator of Hereford, to be accounted for henceforth in the roll of escheats. He was instructed to make a similar surrender of his Shropshire fiefs, but put off doing so until October 4, 1361, when he tardily obeyed a writ dated more than two years before. This was the end of his account, for in October 1361 he also ended his responsibility for Worcestershire. Before that day, he tells us, all the chamber fees in that shire had been entirely delivered "from the king's hand" and from his own custody. The phrase "the king's hand" we have met before as a synonym for the chamber, but it is curious that Stoke should have employed it to express the transference of a royal fief from himself, the chamber escheator, to the king's escheator. We cannot help suspecting that in contemporary opinion the absorption of the chamber lands in the ordinary domain involved some diminution of the king's personal responsibility. For all his years of account Stoke only paid £16 : 2 : 7 into the exchequer. This once more illustrates the insignificance of the net issues of the chamber lands.¹

Some indirect light may be thrown upon the retrenchment of the activities of the royal chamber by the facts known about the chambers of some of the greater magnates. We are fortunate in still possessing in the Public Record Office a full series of household accounts of the lady Elizabeth of Clare, who was not only one of the three Gloucester coheiresses, but obtained extensive domains by her three marriages. Her chief financial officer was, as might be expected, her receiver. It seems pretty clear that the receiver was properly the receiver of the chamber, the chamber being the lady's financial office, from which her wardrobe derived most of its supplies. Parallel to Elizabeth's wardrobe was her chamber in the narrower sense of a domestic office. Up to 1350 both chamber and wardrobe had their respective clerks. In 1350, however, William Manton, already for ten years clerk of Elizabeth's wardrobe, was also appointed clerk of her chamber. This

¹ *Pipe*, 207/44d (36 Edw. III.): "Compotus Johannis de Stoke, custodis feodorum camere regis reservatorum in com. Wygorn. Salop. et Hereford." The most interesting phrase is the statement that "ante quod festum (*i.e.* Michaelmas, 35 Edw. III.) omnia feoda illa in eodem comitatu (*i.e.* Worcestershire) totaliter deliberata fuerunt extra manum regis." Compare *C.F.R.* vii. 108, which shows that the order to surrender to the escheators of all three shires was issued on Oct. 1 addressed to Stoke, "keeper (as is said) of the fees lately reserved to the chamber."

was, in effect, the amalgamation of the two offices, which, as thus united, remained dependent on the receiver for its supplies. This amalgamation in 1350 suggests analogies with the changes in the royal chamber five years later,¹ indicating, as it does, similar movements in both the establishments of the royal family and of the magnates. The consequence of the reform was the completion of the centralisation of the revenue under the receiver, who thus obtained financial control similar to that which the chamber changes of 1355-56 secured for the king's exchequer. It further suggests that administrative convenience was the real motive force in both cases, and that it is vain to seek any deep political reason for the reversal of royal chamber policy on the eve of the battle of Poitiers.

¹ See for all this, Miss Clare Musgrave's unpublished London M.A. thesis, on "The Household of Elizabeth of Clare," which is based upon a careful working up of the Clare household accounts, preserved in *E.A.*, bundles 91-95, and elsewhere. See above, iii. 199. There was a similar amalgamation in greater households than that of Elizabeth, notably that of John of Gaunt and his daughters. Naturally the non-royal households tended towards greater simplification.

SECTION IV

STABILISATION, 1356-1399

Various authorities inherited the chamber's lapsed estate, with its attendant privileges and obligations. The wardrobe took over some of the work, but more still, necessarily, went to the exchequer. There are many examples of writs instructing persons, who had hitherto paid fermes or fines to the chamber, to tender them henceforth in the exchequer.¹ Similarly, pensions and grants, earlier issued from the chamber, were made payable from the exchequer. There was no longer any question of the chamber being able to stand up against the great financial authority on which it was dependent for its only regular income. Such remnants of chamber lands as still remained with the crown were assimilated to the other royal domains, and subjected to exchequer jurisdiction. The care of buildings and repairs on chamber manors passed to the clerk of the king's works.² The exchequer received the issues of alien priories, such as Burstall. The administrative business involved in the custody of chamber seals gradually passed to the signet office, that new household secretariat which was ultimately to become the source of most of our modern public departments. The keeper of the king's ships continued his ancient function of providing for and repairing the royal navy without any relation to the chamber.³ Henceforth the privy wardrobe in the Tower pursued its way in comparative independence of the chamber. Forfeitures now seldom came within the chamber's province, and if the machinery of the

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 158. An order of Sept. 20, 1355, to Robert, earl of Suffolk, to pay the exchequer the yearly ferm for Hethersett, which, on June 26, 1346, the king had committed to his custody for a ferm payable in the chamber.

² For instance, among the places where Geoffrey Chaucer, who held this office from 1389 to 1391, acted, were some former chamber manors such as Byfleet, Langley and Sheen; *C.P.R.*, 1388-92, p. 82. In Rothwell's accounts, 1353-55, payments to clerks of the works are included among "denarii soluti extra cameram"; *E.A.* 391/1.

³ For example, J. Lincoln, appointed Sept. 20, 1378 (*C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 275); G. Elmsale, appointed Apr. 11, 1394 (*ib.*, 1391-96, p. 489); and John Chamberlain, appointed on Mar. 3, 1399 (*ib.*, 1396-99, p. 476).

exchequer were inadequate, recourse was had to special royal commissions, which co-operated with the escheators and the exchequer.¹ This method was adopted with the great forfeitures which followed the royalist triumph of 1397. An occasional reversion to the earlier custom, as in the case of John Holland, was but the exception which proved the rule.²

The result of all these changes was that the chamber from 1355 to 1399 was not very much more than what the chamber had been under Edward I. It would be a mistake, however, to minimise its importance. The chamber was still strong enough to be contrasted with the household, and was, therefore, a great deal more than the chamber which ranked simply as one of the departments of the household.³ With a small break only between 1377-80, it enjoyed a regular income which could easily be increased upon occasion; its officers included many of the innermost circle of the king's confidants; and its administrative work still extended from the private business of the king to a share in the national administration.

The essential condition of the future activity of the chamber was the provision for it of an assured, definite income, and it was in accordance with the tendency of the time that such income should be derived from the exchequer. Experiments in this direction were made, and a permanent scheme adopted, before the chamber lands were finally abandoned. As early as the autumn of 1354 there was allotted to the king in his chamber a certain annual income to be paid by the exchequer. The allow-

¹ *Ib.* pp. 307-308, describes the various commissions appointed to survey the lands, etc., of traitors. The local escheators are included in each one. The accounts for them were to be rendered at the exchequer.

² When John Holland, Richard II.'s half-brother, had his lands seized as the murderer of Ralph Stafford, on Sept. 14, 1385, a signet letter of that date, to Pole the chancellor, ordered that "les reuenues et profits des queles nous auons ordenez et volons qe soient annuelment deliueriez pur les despenses de nostre chambre. Si vous mandons par tant qe vous facez ordiner sufficeantment . . . au fin qe nous ent soions entierrement responduz en nostre chambre"; *C.W.* ff. 1346-1351. The seizure was a very temporary one, as Richard pardoned his brother on Feb. 8, 1386; *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 99. It may be noted that both Holland and Ralph Stafford were "knights of the household." It is not impossible that this exceptional reservation of Holland's lands to the chamber was made to keep their administration in friendly hands.

³ See, for example, privy seal of Feb. 14, 1361, assigning money to Lionel, earl of Ulster, "as well for the expenses of his household as for his chamber"; *Exch. of Rec., War. for Issue*, bu. 7.

ance was first fixed at 5000 marks a year, payable at Michaelmas and Easter.¹ Presumably this was not enough, because in 1355 exactly double that amount, payable at the four quarter days,² was assigned in the same way.³ This sum evidently was sufficient, for no further experiments were made. From 1355 to 1377 the chamber was in the comfortable position of receiving a yearly income of not less than 10,000 marks. For the rest of the reign of Edward III., that income was the sheet anchor of chamber finance.

It would be a matter of labour only, to take from the admirably preserved issue rolls of the exchequer the details of the payment of this income for the whole of these twenty-three years, but the result would hardly be worth the trouble so long as no printed calendars facilitate investigation. On the whole, payment was made regularly and to the full amount. Sometimes the quarterly allowance was paid in advance; sometimes it was several weeks late; often it was distributed in smaller sums scattered over the term.⁴ Occasionally the exchequer made a point of deducting from the 10,000 marks any direct payments it had made on chamber account. For example, in March, July and November 1376, the exchequer paid directly for the purchase of scarlet cloth for a papal nuncio, and of plate and jewels for the king's use. These and other such sums were deducted from the allowance for Easter term, 1376.⁵ At times, therefore, some part of an instalment was paid directly to chamber creditors, and in that way did not actually pass through the chamber. This is analogous to the way in which a large part of the wardrobe's income was paid by the exchequer, not to the wardrobe directly, but indirectly through the creditors of the wardrobe. During the period between June 1364 and Michaelmas 1365, no part of the fixed income was

¹ *I.R.* 375, 377. The first payment recorded is of 2500 marks paid on Dec. 19, 1354, the instalment for that Michaelmas term.

² Michaelmas, Christmas, Easter and Midsummer Day.

³ *I.R.* 378.

⁴ The printed issue roll for Michaelmas 1369 to Michaelmas 1370 illustrates the usual methods of payment, when £7666:13:4 went to the chamber on account of the fixed income; the extra £1000 consisting of £666:13:4 arrears of the previous year, and £333:6:8 anticipation of the following year; *Brantingham's Issue Roll*, pp. 113, 205, 284, 453, 475. *E.H.R.* xxxix. 413-419, prints various statements and estimates of exchequer disbursements for 1359-64, which also show that the 10,000 marks were duly paid to the chamber in that period.

⁵ *I.R.* 459, 460, 461.

paid, but on October 30, 1365, £10,000 were paid, in full payment of the allowance for that period and for the current Michaelmas term.¹ Some of the quarterly sums paid seem to have exceeded the due allowance. On the other hand, here and there an instalment seems not to have been paid at all, though it is possible such apparent lapses are due to neglect on the part of the responsible clerks to record the disbursement rightly, especially if it were made in one of the many indirect ways open. Between 1370 and 1377, for example, when the payments were slightly more irregular than earlier, the amount paid in 1370-71 in fixed income exceeded the 10,000 marks by £547 : 6 : 8, in 1375 it fell short of the 10,000 marks by £102 : 18 : 1, and in the broken last year of the reign (nine months only) it fell short by as much as £5022 : 6 : 8.²

Some uncertainty seems to have obtained in the minds of exchequer officials, and perhaps, too, in the minds of chamber officials, to begin with, because in 1355 the Easter term instalment seems to have been paid to the chamber twice, and payments of the 10,000 marks overlapped payments of the 5000 marks.³ None of the writs directing the exchequer to pay either the 5000 marks or the 10,000 marks have survived, and our knowledge of them rests entirely upon the issue rolls. The clerks, who recorded there the payment of each instalment, were careful to register their authority, but the date of the warrant is never given, the reference being solely to the file on which the writ happened to be placed. From such evidence it is impossible to discover the actual date of the writ and to decide exactly how many writs were sent out. Clearly, before the first payment on December 19, 1354, a writ of privy seal was issued authorising the payment of 5000 marks a year, and sometime before October 1355 there was issued another writ of privy seal authorising the payment of

¹ *Ib.* 425.

² *Ib.* 375-462 (29-51 Edw. III.), *passim*.

³ *Ib.* 375, 376, 377, 378. The evidence afforded by these rolls is puzzling. To take three instances only. The instalment for Easter term, 1355, is recorded as having been paid first in March then in June. £100 of the Michaelmas, 1355, instalment of the 5000 marks was paid in advance, and in the following autumn and winter there was paid for the same term the full allowance of the 10,000 marks. In Michaelmas term, 1355, £166 : 13 : 4 was paid to complete the previous Midsummer term's allowance of the 10,000 marks, yet there is no evidence that the other part of the allowance for that term was paid either before or after.

10,000 marks a year.¹ It is unlikely that there would be issued more than these two writs.²

For the income thus provided for the chamber from the exchequer, the king wished "no one to be charged for him," and for each payment made to the chamber a receipt under the "signet seal" or "secret seal" was given to the exchequer and safely filed by that office.³ In short, the chamber was to be regarded as the king's "privy purse," so that no question of accountability could arise. This was, in effect, a reversion to the system of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, with the additional advantage that a reasonable and regular income was substituted for the scanty proceeds of the former chamber estate and the irregular subventions of earlier periods.

Some casual income went from the exchequer to the chamber in most years, but relatively little addition was made to the stipulated 10,000 marks,⁴ the *certum*, as it was called. In the years 1359-63, for instance, in which £17,840 went to the king in his chamber on account of the annual 10,000 marks, the additional exchequer payments to the chamber amounted to £5512 : 16 : 6 only.⁵ Yet, in July and August 1358, as much as £3283 : 2 : 10 "beyond the 10,000 marks" were paid by the exchequer to the king in his chamber. In the year Michaelmas 1358 to Michaelmas 1359, £1375 : 3 : 8 were paid to the chamber beyond the *certum* of

¹ *I.R.* 375, 376 (Dec. 19, 1354, and Mar. 26, 1355); *ib.* 378 (Oct. 3, 1355: it is not impossible that this second writ was issued in Easter term, 1355).

² *Ib.* 425-462 (40-51 Edw. III.). The payments made on Dec. 30, 1376, Feb. 9 and 25, 1377, are described as being part of 5000 marks a year payable to the king in his chamber—presumably a scribal error of 5000 for 10,000 marks due to too hasty reference to the files of "mandata"; *ib.* 461.

³ *Ib.* 375-462, *passim*. At least two original receipts survive, one dated Oct. 26, 1356, and the other Mar. 14, 1358; *Exch. of Receipt, Warrants for Issue*, 5/34. The earlier receipt runs: "Edward par la grace de Dieu roi Dengleterre et de Fraunce et seigneur Dirland. A ceux qui cestes noz lettres verront, saluz. Come chose soit que nous auoms receu deuers nous meismes et en nostre presence pur nostre chambre del honorable pier en Dieu . . . euesqz de Wyncestre, nostre tresorer, et de les chamberleins de nostre eschequer, deux mille et cynk centz marz du terme de Pasche darrein passe de les dys mille marz par an queux nous auoms ordeine de prendre pur nostre chambre de nostre tresorie par les maines de noz tresorer et chamberleins, des queux deux mille et cynk centz marz nous ne voloms que nuly ensoit chargez deuers nous, einz que la deliuerance soit fait a nous meismes saunz autre persone de noz nomer. En tesmoignance de quele chose a cestes noz lettres ouertes enauoms fait mettre le seal de nostre signet quele nous vsoms au present. Done a Mortelake, le xxvj. iour Doctobre, lan de nostre regne Dengleterre trentisme, et de Fraunce disseptisme." ⁴ *I.R.* 375-462, *passim*. ⁵ *E.H.R.* xxxix. 418.

10,000 marks,¹ while from time to time the exchequer was called upon to pay sums to the chamber to meet miscellaneous expenses which seem personal to the king. Thus, in 1360, there were large exchequer issues to the chamber for jewels bought by the chamber to be given to the king of France and his retinue.² Later, on October 15, 1361, £1478 : 8 : 8 were similarly paid to the chamber for jewels, bought chiefly for the marriage of the prince of Wales.³ Again, in Michaelmas term, 1365-66, the exchequer paid to the chamber £2370 : 10 : 4, for jewels bought by the chamber and given by the king and queen and their children to the king's daughter Isabella and others, on the occasion of Isabella's wedding.⁴ To this casual income must be added other sums, sometimes of fair amount, which reached the chamber directly without passing through the exchequer.⁵ Not least important among these were the fees paid to the chamber by the captains and keepers of castles and lands in Normandy and Brittany, for the privilege of farming such estates.⁶ In 1365 the keepers of Ploermel and other Breton towns paid 5000 marks into the chamber, as satisfaction for their debts to the crown, and the exchequer was directed to discharge

¹ *I.R.* 391, 394, 396.

² *Devon*, p. 176.

³ *I.R.* 409. The prince was married on Oct. 10, 1361.

⁴ *Ib.* 425. Payments made to chamber officials are not to be regarded as payments to the chamber, unless definitely so described. Many of these officials, and none more than Helming Leget, receiver from 1362 to 1375 (see later, p. 332, *et seq.*), were concerned in transactions which may or may not have been connected with the chamber. Among these was the presumably lucrative one of cashing or discounting warrants for issue in favour of foreign servants and messengers. The money used may have come either from the chamber funds or from the private means of the official. The reason for the transaction was no doubt that foreign emissaries had little time to spare and found it simpler and quicker to have a court official, he being on the spot, cash their warrants for a consideration, and himself get the money from the exchequer later, than to go to the exchequer themselves. We may illustrate this type of transaction by reference to some in which Leget was concerned in 1369-70, printed in *Brantingham's Roll*, pp. 145, 146, 151, 152, 167, 371, 479. Also, the sums paid to Leget for the expenses of himself and his retinue in the war, were not disbursements to the chamber, but were nominal payments to the wardrobe which still passed these war expenses through its accounts; *ib.* p. 447.

⁵ Any attempt to estimate the annual revenue of the chamber at best can give only an approximate result. Special care is needed to distinguish the various elements which go to make the gross receipts for the year. These include fixed and casual income from the exchequer, anticipation and arrears of fixed income, repayment of loans, payments from ransoms, purely book-keeping transactions, and casual payments made directly to the chamber, and therefore not recorded in the issue rolls (though doubtless to be found scattered in various pipe and foreign rolls). Obviously the yearly receipts were not the same as the income for any one year.

⁶ See above, pp. 250-251.

them of their obligations.¹ Against all such persons making similar payments to the chamber, the exchequer was still instructed to make no claim.

In the early reign of Richard II. there was a restriction of chamber activity. The annual exchequer *certum* of 10,000 marks absolutely disappeared. This was due to the minority, not to any change in the conception of the chamber and its functions. A boy king had no need for a privy purse, regularly replenished on a liberal scale. Accordingly, the sums paid to the chamber by the exchequer became fitful and ridiculously small in comparison with those of previous years. For the first three exchequer years of the reign they were £665 : 5 : 3 (June 1377 to Michaelmas 1378); £740 : 7 : 4 (Michaelmas 1378 to Michaelmas 1379); and £1416 : 5 : 11 (Michaelmas 1379 to Michaelmas 1380).² The heavier of these issues were all for jewels and plate.³ The other items were chiefly for necessary expenses,⁴ for the king's private business,⁵ and for the purchase of such articles as ostriches, falcons and books.⁶ In these years, when there was no large regular income administered and spent at the discretion of the chamber officers, the chamber seems to have obtained money from the exchequer for each specific purchase as the need arose.⁷

Despite this, the financial aspect of the chamber did not lose its importance. Indeed, it was as a financial body, as a sort of royal privy purse, that the chamber was now, as in the early days

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1364-68, p. 145. Cf. *ib.* p. 223, and *C.P.R.*, 1370-74, p. 26.

² *I.R.* 463-480 (1-3 R. II.).

³ £185 : 5 : 3 in 1377-78; £447 : 0 : 8 (plate only) in 1378-79; and £941 : 12 : 7 in 1379-80. When, in 1381, one of the chamberlains of the exchequer who was also keeper of certain of the king's jewels, John Bacon, handed over to the chamber a certain "Spanish crown," the chamber was debited in the issue rolls with the value of the crown (£1719 : 13 : 4). Bacon disbursed to various persons a large part of the jewels in his care, and the entries on the issue rolls were balanced by corresponding entries in the receipt rolls; *I.R.* 484; *R.R.* 541 (Sept. 23, 1381).

⁴ "Pro necessariis et necnon diuersis custubus in camera sua."

⁵ "Pro quibusdam secretis negociis personam ipsius domini regis tangentibus." Cf. *I.R.* 487 (m. 11): "pro secretis expensis camere."

⁶ *I.R.* 472 (Apr. 26, 1379); 478 (Sept. 12, 1380). Cf. *Devon*, p. 213, where the record of the payment of £28 for a French Bible and two volumes of romances is translated in full.

⁷ During the period July 1, 1378-June 10, 1379, some money was obtained from the king's wardrobe: *M.R.K.R.* 158, breu. dir. bar., Trin. t.; enrolment of a writ of privy seal, dated May 4, 1381, directing the treasurer and barons to allow the sum concerned, £77 : 6 : 8, to the keeper of the wardrobe at the audit of his account.

of the *camera curie*,¹ chiefly regarded. When, on the eve of his accession, the citizens of London declared to the little Richard of Bordeaux, that London was his chamber, they could hardly have meant anything but that London, with its trade and wealth, was the backbone of the royal finances.² As Richard II. grew older and his need became greater, the chamber regained something of its old position.

Within three years of the young king's accession a fixed income was restored. This time the *certum* was no more than £1500 a year. It was, however, payable not by the exchequer directly, but by the collectors of customs in three of the chief ports. On May 1, 1380, the collectors of customs in London, Hull and Boston, were severally ordered to pay annually, as from Easter last, to the king in his chamber, £500 in equal parts at Michaelmas and Easter.³ For each payment they were to have a receipt from the sub-chamberlain, which was to be sufficient warrant for them to have the sums allowed on their accounts at the exchequer. For two years, 1380-82, this arrangement was maintained. The income

¹ An interesting illustration of the continuity of the late mediæval chamber with the Norman *camera curie* is given by Dr. J. H. Round, *The King's Serjeants*, pp. 322-324, where he shows that the "ounce of gold" still claimed by the chapter of Westminster "by the hands of the treasurer of the king's chamber" can be traced back to the writ of Henry I. (published by Dr. J. Armitage Robinson, *Gilbert Crispin*, p. 141), directing the steward and chamberlain to deliver an ounce of gold to the three abbeys of Westminster, Gloucester and Winchester, in which the king annually "wore his crown." It was already a "custom" in 1100, the probable date of the writ.

² Walsingham, i. 329: "*civitatem vestram, cameram scilicet vestram, qui in proximo eritis noster rex.*" The same phrase is applied later to London by the monk of Westminster (p. 31), who tells how, in 1384, John Northampton "*nitebatur civitatem Londonie, cameram suam*" (i.e. *regis*) "*perturbare.*" Another writer who calls London the king's chamber is the poet Gower:

*Regis enim camera fuit urbs hoc tempore vera
In qua confisus multum fuit ille gausus.*

Cronica Tripartita in Gower, *Works*, iv. 341, ed. Macaulay. Coventry was sometimes called the prince's chamber, and Bristol the queen's; Miss Dormer Harris, *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, 4th series, iii. 104. The idea was not a new one. So early as 1328 Mortimer and Isabella had appealed to London, as the king's chamber, not to help Henry of Lancaster; *Cal. Plea and Mem. Rolls, London, 1323-64*, p. 77.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 490. The writs are inadequately calendared in *C.P.R.* for one of the most important points, that letters of the subchamberlain were to be the sole authority for allowance at account, is entirely ignored; cf. *Patent Roll*, 307/15, May 1, 1380. Fortunately the writ to Boston is also enrolled on the fine roll. The calendarer here supplied the vital information suppressed by his colleague; *C.F.R.* ix. 203.

was paid regularly and the collectors of customs seem to have had no difficulty in getting the subchamberlain's letters of acquittance accepted by the exchequer.¹ Is it possible that the payment of the fixed income to the chamber directly by the collectors was an attempt on the part of the subchamberlain, Simon Burley, to make the chamber independent of the exchequer? However, the chamber continued to draw from the exchequer some casual revenue: £994 : 18 : 8 in 1380-81, and £238 : 13 : 4 in 1381-82.²

In Michaelmas term, 1382, a further change was made. The *certum* was increased from £1500 to £2000, and was now made payable at the exchequer instead of by the collectors of customs in the three ports.³ The exchequer thus took full responsibility, and, as we should expect, record of the payment of the *certum* was now made in the issue rolls. This arrangement remained operative for the next three and a half years, 1382-86.⁴

Precisely what happened during the six years from 1386 to 1392 is hard to explain. Conditions generally were unsettled in this period, and that state of things is clearly reflected in the chamber finances, for when the king was most under tutelage, the very existence of the chamber *certum* was precarious, while it gained strength and steadiness with his recapture of power.

¹ The record of the payment of the fixed income is to be found in the customs' enrolled accounts, and in the pipe rolls; *Enrolled Accounts, Customs*, 14, mm. 7d., 21d., 31. *Pipe* 226, m. Adhuc Res. Ebor.; m. Adhuc Item Berk.; m. Adhuc Item London: 227, m. Item Ebor. and dorse; m. Item London. *M.R.K.R.* 158, breu. dir. bar. Michaelis (m. xxviij.); Hil. (mm. ix d., xv.); 159, breu. dir. bar. Mich. (mm. vij, xxjd; see also com. recorda, m. xxxviij, for the same term); Hil. (m. ij). There is no record of any payment for Easter term, 1380.

² *I.R.* 481-492 (4-5 Richard II.), *passim*. A payment of £100 made by the exchequer to the chamber on Feb. 1, 1381, was repaid by the chamber on May 6, 1381. This was described, in the receipt rolls, as a "prestitum," that is, of course, an advance, or, in effect, a loan.

³ *I.R.* 493 (6 R. II.). The writ of privy seal introducing the new scheme is said by the issue roll to have been filed among the mandates of Michaelmas term, 6 Richard II., but it cannot now be found. The first payment under it is recorded for Dec. 20, 1382, when the chamber was given £250 to complete the £1000 allowance for Easter term, 1382. The writ, therefore, was retrospective. £750, it will be remembered, had already been paid to the chamber by the collectors of the three ports under the old regulation for that term.

⁴ On one occasion the exchequer paid an instalment twice, but the chamber refunded the sum in question. The instalment for Michaelmas term, 7 Ric. II. (1383), was not, apparently, fully paid, but otherwise the money was paid fairly regularly. The casual revenue from the exchequer was chiefly for jewels bought by the chamber, and repayment by the exchequer of loans made by various persons to the chamber.

It was indeed part of baronial policy to restrict Richard's chamber. The result appeared in Easter term, 1386. Of the payments made for that term, the first two were described as part of £2000 a year ; the third was described as part of a "greater sum," ordered by the king to be paid to the chamber for its expenses ; and the fourth was described as part of £4000 a year payable to the chamber. All four payments amounted to £1750 only, and as there is no record of more having been paid for that term, the full £2000 a year was not received, much less £4000. In 1386-87, £2093 : 6 : 8 were paid to the chamber by the exchequer, as part of a "greater annual sum." For the years 1387-90 it is impossible to disentangle the fixed from the casual revenue payments, because the description of each disbursement is too vaguely worded. Apparently, however, altogether there were paid £4080 : 0 : 4 in 1387-88, £2510 in 1388-89, and £2540 in 1389-90.¹ The probable explanation of these puzzling figures is that, while Richard was striving to double the exchequer grant to the chamber, the baronial opposition stood out either for its reduction, or for it remaining at £2000 a year.

When we get to 1390, the mist lifts a little, but only to reveal other disquieting features. In the year 1390-91, and indeed to the end of 1391, the disbursements were variously described.

¹ I offer these figures under all reserves, for calculations based on entries in the issue and receipt rolls are singularly liable to error. I should also point out that to use issue and receipt rolls apart from each other often leads to disastrous results. Perhaps in this connection a transaction may be mentioned which on the surface seemed simple, but on examination proved to be more complex. On the issue rolls for Michaelmas term, 12 Richard II. (521-523) under the date Dec. 9, 1388, there is this entry : "Domino regi in camera sua. In denariis in eandem cameram liberatis, videlicet in precio cuiusdam mitre que fuit episcopi Cicestrie, dicto domino regi forisfacte, racione iudicii versus dictum episcopum in ultimo parlamento regis, apud Westmonasterium tento redditu, pro certis secretis negociis ad voluntatem regis in camera predicta faciendis . . . cccxxxiiij li. vj s. viij d." One might well suppose from this, that the mitre had been handed over by the chamber to the exchequer in exchange for its cash value. Reference to the receipt rolls for that term tells a different tale. There, under the same date, is this entry : "De venerabili patre Thoma, archiepiscopo Eboraci, cccxxxiiij li. vj s. viij d. de precio cuiusdam mitre, que fuit episcopi Cicestrie, regi forisfacte. Pro camera regis per breue de priuato sigillo hoc termino." In other words, on the warrant of a writ of privy seal directed to the exchequer, the chamber was given a tally for £333 : 6 : 8, made out in the name of archbishop Arundel of York, who, for some reason not specified, was buying this mitre formerly belonging to Thomas Rushook, the king's confessor and bishop of Chichester, whose goods had been declared forfeit to the king by the Merciless Parliament which met at Westminster on Feb. 3, 1388. See above, iii. 381, 434, 436.

Sums, amounting in all to £2613 : 6 : 8,¹ were paid at different times to the chamber by the exchequer "in full payment of all arrears due to the king for the chamber, up to the feast of Michaelmas 1391, of those 4000 marks reserved and assigned to be taken each year at the exchequer at Michaelmas and Easter in equal parts for the *certum* of the said chamber." It does not appear when the *certum* was fixed at 4000 marks, nor for which years arrears were due, but the total arrears paid did not reach one year's income at the 4000 mark rate. It may be that these payments were for the income for 1390-91, but it is equally likely that they were not. Other sums, of £700, £1020, and 500 marks, were made for ordinary chamber business ("secret and necessary expenses in the chamber"), and for "certain arduous and urgent business touching the king."² In 1392-93 there were paid, by warrant of a special mandate from the king, £3171 : 0 : 3 to Guy Mone, receiver of the chamber, "to help acquit the ancient debts of the king's chamber." It seems probable, therefore, that no *certum* was paid to the chamber for 1390-91, and I can find no record of any being paid for Michaelmas term, 1391-92, but the full allowance for Easter term, 1392, of the annual 4000 marks was paid. In that same term there were also paid £470 : 4 : 2 of the annual 4000 marks towards the allowance for the next Michaelmas term. A little later in the term there were paid £1465, described as part of the allowance for the following Michaelmas term of "£4000 reserved and assigned to be taken each year at the exchequer for the chamber *certum*." It is this conflicting evidence that is so puzzling. Was the chamber's fixed income actually £4000 in Easter term, 1386, then 4000 marks for a time, before becoming £4000 again in 1392? Or, is the confusion due to uncertainty on the part of the exchequer, and was the stipulated amount really £4000 all the time from 1386 to 1392? Or, was there for a time no *certum* at all? So far, satisfactory answers to these questions have not been found. We may feel assured, however, that

¹ Of this, £2266 : 13 : 4 were the proceeds "de vendicione forisfacturarum eidem domino regi in parlamento suo apud Westm. anno xj^o tento adiudicatarum." Many payments were, of course, made by warrant of writs of privy seal issued in the current terms.

² "Pro certis arduis et urgentibus negociis statum dicti domini regis contingentibus." The phrase suggests the chamber played some part in the political doings of this time.

Richard's slowness in asserting his claim for a larger allowance to the chamber is evidence of the prudence and moderation which characterised his early years of personal rule.

With the coming of Michaelmas term, 1392, the king apparently put down his foot. From that time the chamber's £4000 a year was assured. In October 1392 there was paid the balance of the Michaelmas term allowance of an annual £4000,¹ and the authority cited for such issue was described as a writ of privy seal filed among the mandates of the previous Easter term, that is, Easter term, 1392. From Michaelmas term, 1392, to the end of the reign, a yearly income of £4000 was regularly paid to the chamber by the exchequer.² Indeed, the tendency was to pay the money in advance rather than late, and when Richard II. started on his second Irish expedition at the end of May, 1399, he had already anticipated half the chamber *certum* for 23 Richard II., a month before that year began.³ When warrant for issue was cited, it was always that same writ of privy seal filed among the mandates of Easter term, 1392. Whatever be the true explanation of the payments made by the exchequer to the chamber from 1386 to 1392, it seems clear that in or about Easter term, 1392, a fresh writ was issued to the exchequer, setting forth quite definitely how much was in future to be paid to the chamber each year for its *certum*.⁴

During the last six years of the reign large sums of casual income went from the exchequer to the chamber. In addition to the £3171 : 0 : 3, paid in 1392-93 for the ancient debts of the chamber, there was in 1393-94 so large a sum as £2410 : 6 : 8½, paid by the exchequer to help acquit chamber debts. In the same year of 1393-94, the chamber received from the exchequer

¹ The entry in the issue rolls describes this second payment as being in full payment of the allowance for the term of Michaelmas "proximo futuro," but "futuro" is clearly a slip for "preterito."

² The issue rolls for the terms of Easter 1396, and Michaelmas 1396 have not survived, and the sole surviving issue roll for Easter term, 1397, is so much torn and defaced, that it is of little use here. The evidence of the issue rolls for the other terms is sufficient to justify the claim made above.

³ £2000 in February and May 1399 for Michaelmas term, 1399-1400, and £40 in July 1399 for Easter term, 1400.

⁴ When Sir James Ramsay wrote, "in the 13th year (1389-90) £4000 a year was assigned by writ to the chamber, but considerably more was always drawn," the date, "13th year (1389-90)" was, obviously, a slip for "15th year (1391-1392)"; see *Genesis of Lancaster*, ii. 386, n. 1.

one sum of 1000 marks for certain expenses incurred in the chamber beyond "the sum fixed for such expenses," and another of 2000 marks "of the value of the goods and jewels of Isabella, duchess of York, lately delivered to the king's treasury by the executors of her will, and sold by order of the king, to meet the costs and expenses he was obliged to incur in the chamber for the next Christmas" (1393). Further sums paid were £500, £1000 for expenses of the king's journey to Ireland, and £639 : 1 : 6 for debts due from the chamber to divers persons up to August 10, 1394. The following year, 1394-95, £1000 and £1185 were paid over by the king's order to discharge debts due to various persons from the chamber; £1694 : 13 : 4 for military expenses in Ireland; £200 for chamber expenses beyond the sum assigned *de certo*; and £300 for five hundred large pearls bought for the king's use. £2046 : 16 : 6 were paid for chamber debts in 1395-96, and in 1397-98, £2772 : 8 : 0 were paid at different times for general purposes.¹ In 1398-99, a total of £2289 : 1 : 2 casual income was paid, of which £1117 : 3 : 4 for certain gifts made by the king, were described as "beyond the annual pension and annual *certum* assigned for the chamber," or "beyond the annual *certum* assigned and limited for the chamber." In this period, indeed, the chamber reached the zenith of its prosperity under Richard II., although it seems to have played but a modest part in the carrying out of royal policy.

Besides the income, fixed and casual, from the exchequer, the chamber in Richard II.'s reign, as in the reign of Edward III., could count on receiving a certain amount from other sources. On September 21, 1386, for example, the keepers of the temporalities of Bath and Wells were directed by signet letter to pay the money received therefrom, not to the exchequer as previously ordered, but to the chamber "for the king's use."² Again in April 1398, Thomas Holland, duke of Surrey, paid £1000 into the chamber.³ Presents to the king were paid into it,⁴ and loans,

¹ One payment of £883 : 6 : 8 was from fines made before the king's council and ordered to be paid to the chamber.

² *C.C.R.*, 1385-89, p. 189. This diversion of revenue from the exchequer to the chamber was ordered within a few weeks only of the parliament of 1386, which clipped Richard's wings.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 348.

⁴ Bishop Fordham of Durham gave Richard II. 300 keels of sea coal, whereon the king instructed the mayor and bailiffs of Newcastle to receive the coal, sell it for his profit, "et nous respondre en nostre chambre en toute la haste

mainly of small amount, were liable to be made payable to it.¹ It was still the chamber of "secret expenses,"² and grants, pensions, and other such issues continued to flow from it.³ The general tendency, however, was to relieve the chamber at the expense of the exchequer or some other body.⁴ Briefly, the primary function of the chamber under Richard II. was not to administer but to safeguard.

The reorganisation of 1355-56 meant a good deal more than the mere dependence of the chamber on the exchequer for an income, and the consequent removal of the danger of rivalry between them. The chamber was no longer regarded as an office apart, but was gradually brought into closer relation with the general scheme of financial administration. Two quite different forces seem to have been responsible for this changed position of the chamber. The first was undoubtedly the payment of a fixed annual income from the exchequer. The second was the financial crisis which followed the treaty of Calais in 1360.

During the war years, the ordinary resources of the exchequer had been strained to breaking point, and extraordinary taxation had not met requirements. Faced with an unparalleled deficit, and aware that expenses normally tended to increase rather than

quils purront de touz les deniers en provenant"; *C.W.* f. 1339, Aug. 26, 1383. Compare *C.C.R.*, 1389-92, pp. 308-309.

¹ *Exch. of Receipt, Warrants for Issue*, 12/81, contains record of the repayment of loans made to the chamber, of 100 marks each from the treasurer and controller of the household, and from John Bacon £40, all lent in the chamber in aid of the "expense of our marriage."

² See, for instance, a signet letter in a file of 8 Richard II., recording that Nicholas Brember had paid money into the chamber "pur certains secrees et necessaires busoignes qi nous touchent et notre honour." The account presented by Pakington's executors for his last period as keeper of the wardrobe, from Sept., 1389, to July, 1390, contains the item: "In denariis liberatis in cameram regis, tam pro ludis et secretis suis quam pro secretis expensis suis in cameram ipsius domini regis, infra annum predictum, £10:13:4"; *E.A.* 402/5, m. 28d.

³ Examples: A grant to John Golafre, knight of the chamber, of £20 yearly in the said chamber (*C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 122); a grant to Nicholas Ryvenes, knight, of 20 marks a year, payable by the treasurer of the chamber (*ib.*, 1391-96, p. 479).

⁴ Examples: The chamber grant to Sir John Golafre was surrendered in 1386 in exchange for a new grant of forfeited tenements. If these were to pass out of the king's hands, Golafre was to resume his chamber grant; *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 122. The grant of the king's knight, Thomas Bret, in 1398, in lieu of a grant which he had received in the chamber during pleasure; *ib.*, 1396-99, p. 335.

decrease, the exchequer, as we know, took steps to appreciate the situation at its real value, though it is not absolutely certain whether action was due primarily to external or internal influence.¹ On the conclusion of peace, the exchequer found it could meet its bills and balance its accounts only by using the revenues from Ponthieu and Calais, and the ransoms from France and Burgundy.² At first this policy seems to have been practicable, but there was, and could be, no certainty that payment of the French ransoms would be continued until the whole stipulated amount had been paid, and for some reason not at present clear, the exchequer was not allowed for some time to use all such payments as were made.³ As it happened, the money came in more and more slowly, so that as a source of immediate revenue the French ransoms quickly became exhausted. What the exchequer most needed at all times was ready money, and in times of stress it could ill afford to wait upon the slow traditional methods of revenue collection. Not unnaturally, it looked round for more accessible funds. The chamber, clearly, was at the moment much better off than the exchequer: why then should not its comparative wealth, largely provided by the exchequer, be used to help the exchequer in its hour of need? True, chamber resources could not compare in value with the French ransoms, but at least they were at hand, whereas the French indemnity was not. Accordingly, from 1362 onwards, the chamber not only discharged exchequer obligations, but frequently paid to the exchequer large sums of ready money. Both transactions were technically described by the exchequer as loans (*mutua*). The disadvantage of loans was that they had to be repaid sometime, but the device adopted as a measure of expediency was found so useful and workable that it was continued to the end of the century. Thus the chamber quickly became involved in the system of exchequer borrowings, which was so much developed in the fourteenth century.⁴

¹ *E.H.R.* xxxix. 404-419.

² *Ib.* 415.

³ See later, pp. 329-330.

⁴ *R.R.* and *I.R.*, *passim*. In reading these rolls, care must be taken to distinguish real from purely book-keeping loans, and this is not always easy. It is probable that Edward III., during the early sixties, was saved from bankruptcy only by the advances of the Bardi. Under that hypothesis, the favours heaped on "Lombard" merchants, and the appointment of Walter de' Bardi to the Tower mint, become intelligible. The Bardi, far from withdrawing in disgust from England after the king's alleged "bankruptcy" in 1347, remained an important element in finance and in financial administration for the rest of the

The first chamber loan, of £2760:19:10, was made on February 16, 1362, and was not repaid until October 22, 1366.¹ The period of the largest and most frequent of these loans in Edward III.'s reign was, as we should expect, 1362-70. The chamber lent to the exchequer more than £31,000 in those nine years, and in the next six and a half years at least £14,000.² Much information is, of course, to be found in the receipt and issue rolls, though it is probable that not all such transactions were entered in them. Had chamber records been properly made and preserved, undoubtedly more facts concerning such loans would have been available to us. As an earnest of this is the list of moneys advanced to the exchequer out of the chamber by Helming Leget, receiver of the chamber, between November 25, 1367, and Easter, 1368, which is now among the exchequer accounts in the Public Record Office.³ It is disconcerting to be unable to trace in the exchequer rolls more than one of Leget's items in agreement with it, both as to date and amount.

This list is nevertheless worth analysis, though it raises more questions than it solves. Its arithmetic is wrong in several places, so that its total is not accurate. There are a certain number of small advances for such things as wages, clothing, service books, and horses, falcons and their food. But the significant entries

fourteenth century. For instance, they were given remissions or postponement of customs payments, and special licences to trade; see *M.R.K.R.* 140, com. rec., Trin. t. (1364): "Memorandum quod Johannes Guchus, Johannes Balduin, Silvester de Nicholao, Bartholomeus Buoni et Francus de Lipo, Lombardi, venerunt coram thesaurario et baronibus et aliis de consilio regis, ix. die Julii hoc termino, et concedunt se velle et debere regi satisfacere de omni eo quod per papira et alia memoranda sua inueniri contigerit de customis regi debitis de diuersis mercandis per dictos Lombardos in Anglia adductis et abinde eductis subtractum esse et conelatum. Et super hoc quilibet dictorum Lombardorum deuenit fideiussor pro alio in premissis."

¹ *R.R.* 465, Mich. t. 36 Ed. III.; *I.R.* 429, Mich. t. 41 Ed. III.

² For examples of the methods of repayment of these loans, see *Brantingham's Roll*, pp. 181, 237, 381, 495. Some of the loans made in 1368-69, and in 1376, seem never to have been repaid.

³ *E.A.* 396/8. This consists of two membranes, and is of such interest that I print it below as an appendix to this chapter. The last sentence but one is puzzling, for the only repayment entered on the issue rolls under that date is of £2000 lent on Dec. 21, 1367, "de deniers de Bretagne" for household and public works, while the sentence suggests that the total advances, amounting to £6277:16:2½, were then repaid. Similarly the sums indicated for Snaithe and Gomery are only entered in the issue rolls as delivered to them on May 6, 1368, a later date than any in Leget's list, and then no mention is made of the chamber; *R.R.* 493, and *I.R.* 434, 42 Ed. III. E. t.

are £2000 "from the Breton moneys" for the king's household and public works, and two others of 2500 marks each, advanced to the treasurer to enable him to pay to the chamber its *certeine* for the Christmas and Easter quarters. It is remarkable that a household payment should have gone through the chamber rather than direct to the wardrobe, and a curious piece of technicality that, to keep up the illusion of regularity of payment, the chamber should twice have "lent" the treasurer the money for him to pay to it its quarterly allowance on the *certum*.

Under Richard II. chamber loans to the exchequer were fewer and smaller than under Edward III., though the lack of some and the mutilation of other rolls make exact estimates impossible. The first loan, of £666 : 13 : 4, was made on March 26, 1386, and was repaid in the following July and October.¹ Another of the same amount was made on May 5, 1386, for "the duke of Lancaster's expedition to Spain," and for "certain arduous business touching the war." For the repayment of this loan special arrangements were made. On May 14, 1386, the king and council decided that the 1000 marks should be repaid to the chamber from the tenths and fifteenths granted by the commons, "which shall first be paid into the receipt of the exchequer," thereby safeguarding exchequer rights. The repayment of the loan from this revenue was to take precedence over all other payments therefrom.² Two more loans, of £1000, and £333 : 6 : 8, were made in 1389 and repaid in the same year.³ In December 1396, the king instructed the chamber to lend to the exchequer the large sum of 10,000 marks (40,000 gold crowns of France), and at the same time he provided that money to repay the chamber should be raised from the lands and revenues which had formerly belonged to the late queen Anne.⁴ The exchequer did not enter the sum as received until March 19, 1397,⁵ and the greater part of it was only repaid in 1399.⁶ The last loan, of

¹ *R.R.* 563, Mich. t. 9 R. II.; *I.R.* 512, East. t. 9 R. II.; and 515, Mich. t. 10 R. II.

² *R.R.* 564, and *I.R.* 512, Easter, 9 R. II.; *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 141.

³ *R.R.* 572, Michaelmas, and *I.R.* 524, Easter, 12 R. II.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 46.

⁵ *R.R.* 604, Michaelmas, 20 R. II.

⁶ *I.R.* 561-562, Michaelmas and Easter, 22 R. II. There is no issue roll for Michaelmas term, 20 R. II. (1396-97), so that it is impossible to find out whether or not £2000 was repaid in that term. See *R.R.* 604, Michaelmas term, 20 R. II.

£225, was made on January 8, 1399, and was repaid on February 21, 1399.¹ At least £9558 : 6 : 8 were lent in this way during the reign, and probably more, of which we have so far no knowledge.²

There were other financial transactions in the reign of Edward III., connected with the receipt and storage of the ransoms paid by France, Burgundy and Scotland, in which the chamber shared, though as a passive rather than as an active agent. The problems touching king John's ransom have been discussed already,³ and all we need notice here is the significance of the chamber's association with them. We have seen that, in letters of assignment addressed by Edward III. to the Black Prince in December 1363 and January 1364, reference was made to an unpaid 200,000 crowns, of the first million crowns due from John, being reserved for the king's chamber,⁴ but that the reservation does not seem to have been carried out. And further, that in 1364 the residue of certain payments of John's ransom, which had been stored in the Tower, amounting to £47,171 : 1 : 4, was handed over to the care of the chamber. Whether or not Edward hoped by these and other like methods to enrich the chamber and to have readier access himself to more ample funds, is not clear, for exchequer intervention prevented the operation of any such design. The matter of the record and use of John's ransom was inquired into in 1365, and all the transactions in which the ransom had been involved were regularised. As a result, although money from John's ransom continued to be passed to the chamber, the chamber actually spent little of it, acting rather as a savings bank for the exchequer. Later, in 1369, when war with France was renewed, what of John's ransom had been deposited with the chamber was, with one small exception, refunded in its entirety to the exchequer for war expenses. Not

¹ *R.R.* 611, and *I.R.* 561, Michaelmas, 22 R. II.

² In 2 Richard II., on Sept. 23, 1379, two esquires of the chamber lent to the exchequer £4188 : 10 : 8. This sum does not seem to have come from chamber money, but appears to be a private "loan." It may quite probably be an instance of private persons turning over to the more efficient machinery of the exchequer, the collection of debts due to them. I have not, however, been able to find a record of the repayment of this money; *R.R.* 535, Easter t. 2 R. II.

³ Above, iii. 243-248.

⁴ *Foedera*, iii. 718: "Les queux deux centz mil escuz nous avons reserve et reservons pur les mises de nostre chaumbre."

only John's ransom, but ransoms paid by Scotland, Burgundy and private individuals, found their way to the chamber similarly, and of that money the chamber would seem to have spent something, but by no means all. Even in its weakest moments the exchequer was too powerful for the king to be able to pit his more personal financial department against it with any degree of success. Gradually, for rivalry between the departments, there was substituted a close co-operation, which in the end made for harmony and strength.

We must now turn from the finances to the staffing of the chamber, between 1355 and 1399. Fortunately, a fair amount of information about the subject during this period can be pieced together. The receiver was still an important functionary, though distinctly less prominent than before. This was inevitable from the fact that he no longer was the accounting and administrative officer of a large estate, but was mainly the keeper of the storehouse of the king's petty cash and certain of his valuables. Though considerable sums of money passed through his hands, there seems to have been no obligation on him to explain how it came and for what purposes it was expended. Accordingly no elaborate accounts of the older type now survive, and may never have existed. The few fragmentary accounts we have are invariably memoranda of one single transaction, or of a series of transactions, sometimes large, but generally small.¹

The tendency of the age accounts for the receivership being held almost exclusively by laymen, and this was the easier because so little of the clerical function of accounting now inhered to the office. We may distinguish between the later receivers of Edward III. and those of Richard II., because under the former there was still the solid income of 10,000 marks a year to administer. Yet even in the earlier reign the receivers' exclusive responsibility

¹ The most important of the surviving accounts are (i) H. Leget's account, quoted above, *E.A.* 396/8; (ii) "particule vasarum argenteorum emptarum . . . de Thoma Hassey, aurifabro Londonense, de termino Pasche anno regis xxxix° (1365), etc.," in *ib.* 395/4; and (iii) John Lowick's account in 23 Ric. II., for payments made by him in *Enr. Acc. F.* 1 Hen. IV. G., which is, perhaps, the most typical. Lowick received £66:13:4 from the duke of Surrey, and sets forth in detail how he spent it in safeguarding and carrying the king's jewels from Dublin to Kenilworth, July 17 to Aug. 30, 1399. In strong contrast to the barrenness of the chamber accounts of this period, are the elaborate, beautifully written, well-bound, and clearly arranged chamber accounts of Henry VII.; for example, *E.A.* 413/2; 414/6, 11, 16; 415/3.

was diminished both by the more direct share taken in administration by the chamberlains and the sub-chamberlains, and also by the growing habit of sending any chamber officer to the exchequer to receive what the chamber required.

It follows that after 1355 the receivership of the chamber became something quite different from what it had been earlier. Essentially Richard Norwich had no successor, and for the next few years we read of no receivers at all. Probably William Wykeham was the dominating chamber influence, especially between 1361 and 1363.¹ In these years he was constantly at court, the king acted frequently "on his information," and described him to the pope as the "clerk of our chamber." The dull task of receiving and safeguarding moneys was delegated by the great man to any subordinate official he pleased. If greater authority were necessary to complement the acts of an underling, Wykeham himself could always be invoked.² Gradually there grew up the new and restricted receivership, whose origin and early history must now be traced.

At first the receivership seemed in abeyance. We read of various chamber officers who received moneys, but they are seldom, if ever, called receivers. Among the first to act in such a capacity was William Lambeth, king's clerk, who in 1359 received various vessels of silver into the chamber.³ More certainly among such was the king's yeoman, William Whitehorse, who on March 1, 1361, was pardoned of all actions the king might have against him on account of moneys received by him "over the expenses of the chamber, and on account of jewels and other moveables pertaining to the king's body or chamber in his keeping before this time."⁴ This looks like the customary favour issued to an officer who was quitting his post, and leads us to believe that Whitehorse, before this date, had been receiver of the

¹ See iii. 234, 237-238, and above, pp. 260, 262.

² See, for instance, *C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 421, where in 1362 Helming Leget, receiver, acknowledged the king's contentment with a payment on behalf of certain recognisances which Wykeham had received. So late as 1368 a release and pardon to Wykeham referred to the accounts in which he was bound "because of the receipt and delivery of gold, silver and jewels, as well in the king's chamber, the receipt of the exchequer, as elsewhere"; *C.P.R.*, 1367-70, p. 120.

³ *E.A.* 392/19, an indenture between Lambeth and Helming Leget, showing the former receiving plate of the latter. Was Leget not then attached to the chamber?

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, pp. 557-558.

chamber, though he was never, to my knowledge, so described. The pardon is the more significant since a few weeks earlier, another chamber officer appears busied for the first time, with duties which Whitehorse had formerly discharged.

This new man was Helming Leget, king's yeoman, afterwards king's esquire, belonging to a family of which several other members had been employed in the king's service.¹ Already about the court in 1358, and a participator in the campaign of 1359-60,² Helming was allowed to marry the widow of a lesser tenant-in-chief,³ and henceforth occupied an active, though never perhaps a foremost, position in the chamber. By 1362 he was described as receiver of the chamber,⁴ and he was actively employed in that capacity until 1375, when he was appointed coroner and clerk of the market of the king's household.⁵ It is possible that his successor was William Gambon, another yeoman of the chamber. Gambon, who was described as "keeper of the keys of the coffers of the chamber," was on October 10, 1376, "pardoned of all receipts and issues made by him of the gold, silver, jewels, and other things which have come into his hands during the time in which he made stay with the king, and of all accounts which the king could demand against him."⁶ He was succeeded,

¹ A clerical namesake, Helming Leget, received two crown livings in 1356, and a corrody at Ramsey abbey in 1359; *C.P.R.*, 1354-58, pp. 408, 462; *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 543.

² *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, pp. 136, 399, 478.

³ This was Margaret, widow of Nicholas Mocking, who died on Oct. 14, 1360; *Cal. Inq.* x. 505. She married Leget before May 14, 1362; *C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 329.

⁴ He was called receiver on Aug. 11, 1362 (*C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 421), but was clearly acting in that capacity on Jan. 3 (*C.P.R.*, 1361-64, p. 144) and Apr. 16 of that year (*C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 300). There are many illustrations of his activity up to the early seventies; see issue rolls and receipt rolls, *passim*; *Brantingham's Issue Roll*, pp. 204-205; and *Foedera*, iii. 911. He was only rarely called receiver. He was also called "keeper of the keys of the coffers of the king's jewels and money"; *C.P.R.*, 1367-70, pp. 89, 297. He was in 1366, 1368 and 1369 released from all debts incurred in discharge of these duties.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1374-77, p. 171. I assume that he vacated the receivership for this modest post. On Feb. 19, 1369, he was made constable of Windsor, and keeper of various parks and manors, "for gratuitous service long rendered to the king"; *C.P.R.*, 1367-70, p. 214. His accounts for these offices range from 43 to 51 Edw. III.; *E.A.* 30/14, 32/1, 33/1, 22, 494/9, 495/5. His accounts as coroner and clerk of the market extend from 49 Edw. III. to 1 Ric. II.; *ib.* 257/2. Leget also did business with ships of his own; *C.P.R.*, 1364-67, p. 334; and *ib.*, 1370-74, p. 91.

⁶ *Ib.*, 1374-77, pp. 360-361. Leget was also similarly styled. See note 4, above.

or perhaps directed, by Philip la Vache, knight of the chamber, who was still acting at the time of Edward III.'s death, and supplied from the chamber £1400 for the expenses of the king's funeral.¹

The receivers of Richard II.'s early years are not very easy to disentangle. There is plain reason why there should be such bewildering references to them in the period 1377-80, for we have noted already that in those years the chamber received next to nothing. Possibly Philip la Vache, whom the new king "retained to stay with him as a knight of the chamber," continued in the otiose post.² More probably the under-chamberlain, Simon Burley, knight, acted as receiver for the first year or two, for not only did he receive such payments to the chamber as are recorded in the issue rolls,³ but he was, in December 1382, twice "acquitted in respect of all the king's jewels and of the receipt of the chamber,"⁴ in the formula used, earlier and later, when receivers were discharged of their responsibilities. The final phrase in Burley's acquittance, "as certain persons other than he have had the charge thereof," suggests, however, that he was not ultimately responsible, even though he did receive moneys. Further, before the date of Burley's acquittances, at least three other persons received similar acquittances, and two of them were definitely described as receivers.⁵

The first of these was Baldwin Raddington, of whom we have spoken already in his later capacity as controller of the wardrobe.⁶ Raddington, who was king's esquire by 1377 and a knight by 1385,⁷ began to receive payments for the king in his chamber in

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)*, 5/18.

² *C.P.R.*, 1377-80, p. 104.

³ With one or two exceptions, all the payments in 1 and 2 Ric. II., "domino regi in camera sua," are either "per manus Simonis de Burlegh, subcamerarii," or by the hands of his squire, Ralph Ramsay; *I.R.* 465/7, 10, 13, 1 R. II. Mich. t.; *ib.* 468/2, East. t.; *ib.* 471/8, 12, 19, 2 R. II. Mich. t.; *ib.* 472/2, 11, East. t. One of the above receipts by Burley was "per visum et testimonium Willelmi de Bello Campo, camerarii regis." For Burley, see above, iii. 331.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, pp. 211 (Dec. 12), 218 (Dec. 25). The second acquittance is more comprehensively worded: "in respect of all receipts of jewels and moneys of the king's chamber to the present date, other persons having had the custody thereof, whilst he has been chamberlain and under-chamberlain." See also, *M.R.K.R.* 159, breu. dir. bar. Hilary t. (m. 2), and p. 234, below.

⁵ It should, perhaps, be observed here, that the date of acquittance was rather dependent upon the date of the presentation of account than upon the date of termination of service, even in the chamber.

⁶ See above, pp. 196-199.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 57; *ib.*, 1385-89, p. 57.

1380.¹ Though he became controller of the wardrobe on October 1, 1381, he was described as receiver on the following December 3, and did not receive his acquittance until July 23, 1382, when the receipt of his account was acknowledged.² The association of Burley with him in the acquittance shows that the under-chamberlain was regarded as jointly responsible for chamber receipts. The second was John Salisbury, king's esquire, who was appointed receiver of the chamber on May 11, 1382, and acted until September 11 following. His account was acknowledged, and he himself acquitted both on that day and on the next, the second acquittance also embracing Simon Burley, the under-chamberlain.³ The third was Richard Abberbury, knight of the chamber, who could only have acted for a few weeks, since he was, on November 15, 1382, acquitted of all moneys and jewels received by him.⁴

The position of the next officer exonerated from the custody of chamber money and jewels is even more doubtful. He actually preceded in office the three laymen whose relations to the chamber we have examined, but he may fitly be considered after them since his quittance was not effected until 1384. This was John Bacon, king's clerk, who served Richard before he came to the throne, and ultimately became his secretary.⁵ On August 28, 1377, Bacon was appointed chamberlain of the exchequer, and held that post for some years.⁶ About the same time he was also

¹ The first was "pro quibusdam secretis negotiis," on Apr. 13, 1380; *I.R.* 478/1, 3 R. II. East. t.

² *ib.* 487/11, 5 R. II. Mich. t. For his acquittance, see *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, p. 157, and *M.R.K.R.* 159, breu. dir. bar., headed "pro Baldwino de Redyngton et Simoni de Burele." This is the writ notifying the exchequer of the acquittance, dated Oct. 10.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, pp. 167, 178, and *M.R.K.R.* 159, com. rec. Mich. t., headed "de Johanne de Salesbury, nuper receptore camere regis, exonerando de localibus et denariis per ipsum ad opus regis receptis." Salisbury started life as a clerk, for on Mar. 22, 1327, a privy seal of Edward III. calls him "dilectus armiger noster, tunc clericus noster"; *Exch. of Rec. Warrants for Issue*, file 66. If he were the same as the John Salisbury, keeper of the king's dies in the Tower, he was dead before Nov. 10, 1382; *C.C.R.*, 1377-81, p. 5; *ib.*, 1381-85, p. 171.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, p. 192. His name is sometimes spelt Adderbury, which is perhaps the more correct form. He is called simply "knight of the chamber" in the quittance, and Burley is not associated with him.

⁵ For Bacon's work as secretary, see later, vol. v. ch. xvii.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 23. He still held this office when he became king's secretary, some time before Dec. 3, 1383; *ib.*, 1381-85, p. 341. His successor as chamberlain, Thomas Orgrave, was only appointed on Jan. 27, 1385, to this office, which is described as "lately held by John Bacon, the king's secretary": *ib.* p. 517.

described as keeper of the king's plate,¹ and on May 11, 1378, an ordinance was issued by the advice of the council "for the keeping of the crown jewels and vessels of gold and silver by the king's clerk, John Bacon, one of the chamberlains of the exchequer," as a result of which his financial transactions were to be entered in the "pells of the receipt," and his accounts audited by two or three of the council.² However, the only recorded audit of these accounts was by a larger body, appointed in 1383, which was not rapid in the completion of its task, for it was not until July 5, 1384, that Bacon, "late keeper of the king's jewels," received his quittance.³ All these things point to Bacon's keepership of the jewels being an incident of his exchequer work, and involving no connection with the chamber. Yet the association of an exchequer officer with such a custody suggests the continuance of that co-operation between chamber and exchequer which had prevailed during the period between 1362 and 1377. Moreover, a patent of February 27, 1385, suggests a still closer co-operation between Bacon and the chamber, for there, in familiar phrase, he was acquitted of "all sums received by him on the king's behalf both when he was prince and after his coronation, whilst the said John dealt with the payments of the king's chamber."⁴ The passage tempts one to intercalate Bacon as a receiver between Abberbury and the next undoubted receiver in 1384. It would, however, be unwise to build up so much on so slight a foundation.

Whatever the facts may be, there was a vacancy in the receivership by the autumn of 1384, and on November 28, 1384, the king's esquire, John Beauchamp, was acting as receiver.⁵ Beauchamp remained in office till February 5, 1387, when, having been knighted during the interval, he was advanced to the stewardship of the household and acquitted of his receivership.⁶ Beauchamp's successor was a knight of the chamber, John Golafre,

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, pp. 245-246. His main function was apparently the repeated pawning of the king's jewels as a security for loans; *ib.* pp. 219, 340, 385-386, 461, 544; *ib.*, 1381-85, pp. 104, 149, 154-155. His co-operation with the chamber comes out in the appointment of himself, John Hermesthorp, his fellow chamberlain of the exchequer, and two chamber knights, to view and make an inventory of the jewels and other goods of Edward III. at the time of his death; *Foedera*, iv. 38. In *E.A.* 400/3 he is called "custos vesselorum."

² *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, pp. 291, 335.

³ *Ib.* p. 432.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 552.

⁵ *Ib.*, 1381-85, p. 488; *M.R.K.R.* 161/18 d. breu. dir. bar. Hil. t.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 291.

who received office sometime before that same February 5, and was acquitted on September 29, of the same year.¹ Already on September 9, Golafre had been replaced by Lambert Fermer, a former yeoman of the Black Prince,² and afterwards esquire of the king, who served until June 12, 1391.³

The next receiver, Guy Mone, we have known already for the important part which he played in the court of Richard II.'s later years.⁴ He was the only clerk definitely proved to have been receiver of the chamber under Richard II.⁵ He acted from June 13, 1391, to February 1, 1398, and combined with this office the keepership of the privy seal and the bishopric of St. David's.⁶ As keeper of the privy seal we shall have to speak of him again.⁷ His successor seems to have been John Lowick, king's esquire, who had previously been yeoman of the robes.⁸ He remained in office for the rest of the reign, combining with it the keepership of the privy wardrobe.⁹

At all times the receivers of the chamber had jewels as well as money entrusted to their care. As the responsibilities of the receivership became more and more limited to those of safe custody, an ever increasing emphasis seems to have been thrown upon their duties as keepers of the king's jewels. Under Richard II. the receiver was called "keeper of the king's jewels in the chamber," or "keeper of certain of the king's jewels and vessels of gold and silver," more often than he was called receiver of the chamber, for which "treasurer of the chamber" was some-

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 348. He remained a knight of the chamber for years after this, for example, *ib.*, 1388-92, p. 154. His marriage to a Mohun is recorded by Monk West. p. 218.

² *C.C.R.*, 1392-96, p. 458.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1391-96, p. 177. *I.R.* 518 describes, on Oct. 12, 1387, William Lombard as "receptor eiusdem camere," but later entries refer to Lambert Fermer as receiver.

⁴ See above, pp. 8, 49, 54-55.

⁵ This is, of course, on the assumption that John Bacon was not a receiver of the chamber.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 317. Mone was consecrated bishop on Nov. 11, 1397, and so remained at the chamber three months after he became bishop. He took charge of the privy seal on Feb. 16, 1396; *C.C.R.*, 1392-96, p. 469. He dovetailed the receivership with the privy seal for nearly two years. This combination in one individual of offices in different departments was as common under Richard II. as under Edward III., and suggests the increasing unity of the civil service as a whole.

⁷ See later, vol. v. ch. xvi. on the privy seal under Edward III. and Richard II.

⁸ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 61

⁹ *For. Accts.* 1 H. IV. G.

times an equivalent.¹ He was not the only keeper of the king's jewels, for jewels were also deposited in the exchequer, the great wardrobe, the privy wardrobe and elsewhere. Nevertheless, the custody of jewels gradually became more vital to this office than the charge of money. This tendency, slightly delayed by the events of the latter years of Richard II., became paramount after his fall. In the fifteenth century, the *Black Book of the Household of Edward IV.* speaks of the office of the jewel-house, whose head was keeper of the king's jewels, or treasurer of the chamber.²

We have spoken of the part played by Burley in the direct financial affairs of the chamber. It is a feature of this period that chamberlains and sub-chamberlains had a closer relation to the work of the chamber than they had had since the days of Gaveston and Despenser. This was one important reason why the office of receiver was so overshadowed that it became insignificant. We cannot forbear remembering at this point that the chamberlains and their deputies were, in the last third of the fourteenth century, conspicuous leaders of the thorough-going court party.³ The details of the history of the chamberlainship are complicated by the fact that the earls of Oxford, the hereditary chamberlains of the king, began, for reasons which are obscure, to concern themselves actively with the duties of the chamberlain's office, apparently with the king's goodwill. The confusion is also much aggravated because hereditary, acting and under-chamberlains were all often indifferently described as "king's chamberlains," or simply "chamberlains." From January 1356 to May 1360 at least, John Charlton was king's chamberlain,⁴ but sometime

¹ Raddington was "custos jocalium regis in camera," before he was called receiver; *I.R.* 478, 3 R. II. East. t. m. 1. Compare *Cal. Ancient Deeds*, iii. D. 730. Salisbury was "receiver of the chamber and keeper of certain jewels belonging thereto"; *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, p. 178. Beauchamp was described only as "late keeper of certain of the king's jewels and vessels of gold and silver," when also acquitted for any moneys received by him in the king's name; *ib.*, 1385-89, p. 291. So also with Golafre; *ib.* p. 348. The doubtful receiver, Bacon, was certainly keeper of certain of the king's jewels; *ib.*, 1381-85, p. 291. He was also "receptor certorum jocalium regis Edwardi, aui regis hujus"; *I.R.* 490/14, East. t. 5 R. II. Fermer and Mone, though accounting for jewels, were only called receivers; *C.P.R.*, 1391-96, p. 177; *ib.*, 1396-99, p. 317. Mone was also called treasurer; *ib.*, 1391-96, p. 479.

² *Household Ordinances* (1796), p. 42: "The office of jewel-house hath an architectour, called clerk of the king's, or keeper of the king's jewelles, or tresorer of the chamber."

³ See iii. 234-235, 331-332, 394, 404, 406-408, 463.

⁴ *Ch. R.* 145/21.

before 1360, John Vere, earl of Oxford, petitioned the king in parliament for the restoration to the earldom of Oxford of the office of chief chamberlain to the king.¹ This office, granted to the earls of Oxford by Henry I.,² had in 1265, along with his other offices and dignities, been taken away from Robert Vere, earl of Oxford, because of his support of Montfort, and it was not given back when all else was restored to him in 1266.³ His son Robert repeatedly sued in parliament for the chamberlainship but without success, for although the November-December parliament of 1338 had instructed the exchequer to investigate the claim, no return to the writ had been made.⁴

John's petition seems to have fared no better than those of his father, and he died in 1360 with his ambition unfulfilled, for although the exchequer was again ordered to consult its archives, I can find no evidence that it did so, nor does there appear to be any patent of confirmation to John of the original grant.⁵ Perhaps, however, his assertion of the claim was not without effect, for in 1362 and after, we find his son and heir, Thomas, definitely described and acting as the king's chamberlain.⁶ On the other hand, Thomas' restoration to the hereditary office, and his position as active chamberlain, may have been due less to his father's action than to his own marriage with the granddaughter of Henry, earl of Lancaster.⁷

The reassertion of the Vere claim had one clear result. There were obvious limits to the capacity of an earl to exercise a court office in person, and from the time of earl Thomas (1360-71) we find an under-chamberlain discharging much of the routine

¹ *Rot. Parl.* ii. 397. John said that his ancestors had been appointed for themselves and their heirs "les chiefs chamberleyns des rois d'Engleterre."

² For its early history, see above, i. 89-92. The statement in i. 90, n. 1, that the three charters in question are known only from seventeenth century transcripts, must be modified, for the charter of Henry I. is recited in the Patent Roll of 5 Richard II. under the date Jan. 10, 1382 (*C.P.R.*, 1381-85, p. 65; *Foedera*, iv. 138), and is referred to in earl John's petition. If it is a forgery, it is one of respectable antiquity. In spite of the phrase "magistram camera-riam meam totius Anglie," this charter seems to be authentic in substance.

³ *Rot. Parl.* ii. 397.

⁴ *Ib.*

⁵ *Complete Peerage*, vi. 164, errs in describing the sixth and seventh earls of Oxford as "Great Chamberlain." They possessed the office neither legally nor actually.

⁶ The few charters issued between Mar. 1, 1362, and 1370 were regularly attested by Thomas Vere, earl of Oxford; *Ch. R.* 146, Nos. 519 and 152.

⁷ *Complete Peerage*, vi. 164.

work of the chamberlain. Even before this Sir Guy Brian was described as sub-chamberlain in 1348, and John Chandos was appointed in 1360, before Thomas had established his claim.¹ From that time there is an almost unbroken succession. By August 1363 Sir Richard la Vache was "the king's under-chamberlain."² Vache was followed by Alan Buxhill in 1369,³ and although Richard Pembridge in March 1371 is described as "chamberlain of the king's household,"⁴ it is more likely that he was Buxhill's successor as under-chamberlain.

In September 1371 earl Thomas of Oxford died, leaving as his heir Robert his son, a boy nine years old.⁵ This meant that the hereditary chamberlainship could not be exercised in person. Accordingly a return was made to former usage, and an acting chamberlain replaced both the hereditary and the subordinate chamberlain until Robert attained his majority. William, lord Latimer, Roger Beauchamp and Robert Ashton thus served as chamberlains one after the other during the last years of Edward III.'s reign. We know already the importance of all of these three personages and that the appointment and removal of each of them had political significance.⁶

With the accession of Richard II. further complications arose. Sir Simon Burley, that old servant of the Black Prince of whom we have had much to say in an earlier chapter,⁷ was already chief chamberlain of Richard as prince of Wales. He was now made under-chamberlain to Richard as king and retained this office until his tragic end in 1388. We have seen already that, though seldom prominently pushed forward, he was, perhaps, the most intimate and permanent of the graver advisers of the young king. Meanwhile Robert, earl of Oxford, now about fifteen, was among the noble youths knighted with Richard on St. George's Day, 1377, and claimed, and was allowed, to act as hereditary chief

¹ See lists in vol. v.

² Vache had on Jan. 26, 1361, been appointed keeper of the Tower of London for life; *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 531.

³ *Foedera*, iii. 849, 897, describes him simply as "chamberlain," but in *ib.* p. 963, he is "adonque nostre souz chamberleyn." Buxhill was also constable of the Tower, 1369-77; *C.P.R.*, 1367-70, p. 345; *C.C.R.*, 1374-77, p. 555.

⁴ "Camerarius hospicii regis."

⁵ *Complete Peerage*, vi. 164.

⁶ See above, iii. 279. Latimer is called erroneously "chamberlain of England" in *C. Pap. Reg. Let.* iv. 131, but correctly "the king's chamberlain" in *ib.* p. 133.

⁷ Above, iii. 331, 367-368, 382, n. 3, 404, 434-435.

chamberlain at the coronation ceremony.¹ It was still, apparently, thought best that someone of more mature years should discharge the ordinary obligations of his office. Accordingly, between the coronation day and 1382, three magnates, Sir Guy Brian, Sir William Beauchamp and Sir Aubrey Vere, were called upon to act for short terms as "king's chamberlain." Their rapid succession can easily be connected with the political vicissitudes of the time. The appointment of Vere was doubtless because he was uncle and heir to the young earl, and therefore easily prepared the way for his nephew's personal assumption of his full rights when Robert came of age and took his place in parliament in 1383. Simon Burley had his recognition when, in August 1382, the under-chamberlainship was granted to him for life, an appointment confirmed a year later in consideration of services ranging from the king's earliest infancy to his part in bringing to Richard his bride.² From that time until Oxford's flight and Burley's execution, the chamberlain's powers were entirely in the hands of the hereditary officer and his deputy.

With the Merciless Parliament the position of the chamberlaincy again became complicated. It was clear that the Vere claim was at an end, for when, a few years later, Sir Aubrey was allowed his nephew's earldom and estates, he was expressly excluded from having anything to do with the chamberlainship. Meanwhile the triumphant parliament appointed, on February 12, 1388, Sir Peter Courtenay as "chief chamberlain" during pleasure. By Easter 1390, Richard was able to use his newly won power to supersede Courtenay by his half-brother, John Holland, earl of Huntingdon, who remained in office for the rest of Richard's reign. At first called simply "king's chamberlain,"³ Huntington was, on May 31, 1390, appointed chief chamberlain of England for life.⁴ On September 4, 1393, the office was further defined as being held

¹ *Foedera*, iv. 5: "Et sic idem comes officia illa eodem die coronationis in omnibus adimplevit."

² For precise dates and details of this and other appointments, see the lists in vol. v. For Burley's expenses abroad, see *E.A.* 318/26 and *Enr. Accts.* F. 3 R. II., F. and K.; F. 4 R. II., A. He was away from June 18 to Dec. 1, 1380, Jan. 2 to Mar. 17, 1381, and May 15, 1381, to Jan. 12, 1382. In nineteen months he was only three months in England. For grants in compensation for his losses, see *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, pp. 164, 301; *M.R.K.R.* 157, breu. dir. bar. Easter t. and *Foedera*, iv. 142.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1388-92, p. 194.

⁴ *Ib.*, 1388-92, p. 252.

"as fully as heretofore by the earl of Oxford."¹ This phrase suggests a conscious confusion between the hereditary and household offices. However, on February 2, 1398, at Shrewsbury, the grant was renewed to John Holland and his heirs male, with the addendum "Aubrey de Vere, earl of Oxford, uncle and heir of Robert, late earl of Oxford, who was king's chamberlain in fee, having for himself and his heirs released all right in the said office."² Thus the house of Holland stepped fully into the place of the house of Vere.

There was no immediate appointment to the under-chamberlainship after Burley's fall. But the absorption of the active into the hereditary office soon made a successor to him necessary. Between 1390 and 1393 the courtier Thomas Percy, afterwards earl of Worcester, was under-chamberlain.³ In February 1393 he was replaced by William Scrope, afterwards earl of Wiltshire, a still more whole-hearted supporter of Richard's worst excesses,⁴ who remained in office until the eve of his execution on July 29, 1399. Throughout the reign, then, the "hereditary chamberlain of England" was an active, rather than a formal, officer, represented by a deputy when from any cause he was incompetent to undertake his responsible work in person. We may surmise, however, that the bulk of the work of the office fell to the hands of the under-chamberlain.

Apart from the chamberlains, the numerous knights of the king's chamber took an active share in furthering Richard's personal policy. Of the knights already mentioned Salisbury, Abberbury and James Berners shared, in 1388, the fate of Simon Burley.⁵ Golafre escaped with difficulty,⁶ being first of all condemned to death but soon pardoned and before long brought back into the office. Four of the six reputed "Lollard knights," accused by some of the chroniclers of heresy,

¹ *Ib.*, 1391-96, p. 312.

² *Ib.*, 1396-99, p. 290.

³ Winter robes for 1389-90 went to Peter Courtenay, but both Holland and T. Percy received summer robes for 1390; *E.A.* 402/5. The change was before Easter, for both of them received their fees "pro festo Pasche"; *ib.* m. 32d. It is interesting that the word "subcamerarius" was carefully erased after Percy's name.

⁴ For details and for the political significance of these changes, see above, iii. 463.

⁵ Monk West. pp. 116, 119, 156; Walsingham, ii. 174.

⁶ *Cont. Knighton*, ii. 256, 296.

were undoubtedly knights of Richard II.'s chamber,¹ but it is more certain that they were anti-clerical courtiers than that they were heretics. It is not impossible that the three king's knights, Bushy, Bagot and Green, who were the chief helpers of Scrope in the last and most despotic stage of the reign, were also knights of the chamber. All through the reign these knights of the chamber formed an unpopular class. They were loose livers, military only in name, and strangely contrasted with the distinguished soldiers who were knights of Edward III.'s chamber.² They, with the esquires of the chamber, were ever convenient instruments to execute any king's work that came along. They were constant recipients of grants of lands, office, and of the marriage of rich heiresses.³

Despite the strong evidence of the importance of chamber officials as agents of Richard II.'s policy, and the sound financial position of the chamber, we have no reason for believing that the chamber as an institution was an essential, or even an important, instrument in carrying out Richard II.'s autocratic designs. The chief cause of this lay in the fact that the chamber lacked sufficient organisation, and only a highly organised body could become an important instrument of state. The chamber officers did their work either as individuals or as members of other organisations than the chamber. Their association with the royal chamber gave them constant access to the monarch, and with that the opportunity to win his favour, but no more. There is no evidence of an effort being made to push the chamber into the place it had filled in the days of the Despencers, or in the early part of the personal government of Edward III. When the secret seal became the signet and went out of chamber custody, all the routine work involved in the preparation of

¹ For them see above, iii. 425, n. 1. Of the six knights mentioned by the St. Albans chroniclers as upholders of lollardy, four were knights of the chamber, namely, Neville, Clanvowe, Clifford and Stury.

² See, for example, Walsingham, ii. 156, quoted above, iii. 408, n. 1, and the "capuciati milites" of Walsingham, ii. 159. For an attempt at a list of chamber knights under Richard II., see Appendix I. to this chapter, pp. 344-346.

³ May not Chaucer's "secret" diplomatic missions, e.g. in 1376-79, be connected with his duties as esquire of the chamber? "Secret" and "cameral" were still almost synonymous: cf. *I.R.* 169/11, a payment to J. Flete, clerk of the chamber, "tam pro diuersis armaturis et aliis secretis ad eandem cameram spectantibus quam pro vadiis suis et valletorum dicte camere missorum in negociis domini regis."

writs, and much of the consultative process that preceded their construction, passed to the secretary and the signet office.

It is significant that the signet, which was Richard's special symbol of authority, was now out of all relation to the chamber. If Richard II. feared the high-born and well-endowed lords of the council, he set up against them, not so much the organisation of the chamber, as secret and unauthorised advisory groups, which, even when consisting of chamber officers, had no essential connection with the chamber as an institution. No effort was made to revive the chamber once more as a rival to the exchequer national office of finance, for both exchequer and chamber were now closely related parts of a single financial machine. That this relationship was maintained to the end of our period, and that, to the last, the chamber accommodated the exchequer with considerable loans, is some proof that Richard did not even try to use the chamber for autocratic purposes. Thus it followed that the chamber slowly entered a long period of eclipse. Of its remarkable revival with the establishment of the Tudor monarchy, it is not our business to speak.

APPENDICES TO CHAPTER XIII

I

TENTATIVE LIST OF KNIGHTS OF THE CHAMBER IN THE
REIGN OF RICHARD II.

I have tried to make a list of Richard II.'s knights of the chamber, but the result, given below, is not entirely satisfactory, because there is usually no means of finding out when they began and when they ceased to act. We have, in Exchequer Accounts, copious information about the wages paid to the knights employed in the household. But in most cases there is no distinction made in these records between the king's knights generally and the special king's knights of the chamber. For this list I have used *C.P.R.*, *C.C.R.*, *Foedera*, *Warrants for Issue* and *E.A.* Possibly it might be amplified by working page by page through the Calendars, but I think the result would hardly justify the trouble. There were eleven chamber knights in 1383-84 (*E.A.* 401/2) and eight in 1389-90 (*E.A.* 402/5 m.30d.).

Knights of the King's Chamber, 1377-1399

Abberbury, Richard (queen's chamberlain, Aug. 25, 1383; <i>C.P.R.</i> , 1381-85, p. 311).	June 6, 1379-1385.	<i>I.R.</i> 472; <i>Foedera</i> , iv. 67, 104. <i>C.P.R.</i> , 1381-85, p. 192. <i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42.
Bardolf, Robert.	Feb. 4, 1386.	<i>C.F.R.</i> , 1383-86, pp. 130-31.
Barford, Baldwin.	1383-1395.	<i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42; 402/5, m. 30d.; 403/10, m. 43d. <i>C.P.R.</i> , 1388-92, pp. 177, 185.
Beauchamp, John, of Holt.	Dec. 1, 1385-Feb. 1388.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1385-89, pp. 71, 92.
Berners, James.	Oct. 6, 1385-Feb. 1388.	<i>C.C.R.</i> , 1385-89, p. 382. <i>C.P.R.</i> , 1385-89, pp. 27, 70, 97. <i>C.C.R.</i> , 1385-89, p. 382.

Blount, Thomas.	Oct. 1389–July 19, 1391.	<i>E.A.</i> 402/5, m. 30d. <i>Exch. of R., Warr. for I.</i> 14/96.
Burley, John.	Oct. 28, 1377–Nov. 23, 1381.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1377–81, pp. 33, 281, 492, 588. <i>Ib.</i> , 1381–85, pp. 54, 60.
Burley, Simon.	1383.	<i>E.A.</i> 401/2.
Clanvowe, John.	May 21, 1381–July 1391.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1381–85, pp. 8, 17, 104, 214, 575. <i>Ib.</i> , 1385–89, p. 214. <i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42 ; 402/5, m. 30d. <i>Warr. for I.</i> 14/96.
Clarendon, Roger.	Oct.–Nov. 1390.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1388–92, p. 305. <i>C.C.R.</i> , 1389–92, pp. 210, 212.
Clifford, Lewis.	July 19, 1391.	<i>Exch. of R., Warr. for I.</i> 14/96.
Clifford, Thomas.	Dec. 5, 1382–July 1391.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1381–85, pp. 214, 525, 527, 529. <i>Ib.</i> , 1385–89, pp. 138, 251, 269. <i>E.A.</i> 402/5, m. 30d.
Courtenay, Peter.	May 7, 1383–Jan. 13, 1386.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1381–85, p. 273. <i>Ib.</i> , 1385–89, p. 79. <i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42.
Dagworth, Nicholas.	May 10, 1381. June 23, 1393.	<i>Foedera</i> , iv. 117-118. <i>C.C.R.</i> 1392-96, p. 157.
Felbrigg, Simon.	May 20, 1399.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1396–99, p. 579.
Golafre, John.	Oct. 20, 1385–1395.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1385–89, pp. 36, 122, 161, 304, 339, 348, 359. <i>Ib.</i> , 1388–92, pp. 154, 249, 297, 302, 362. <i>Ib.</i> , 1391–96, p. 74. <i>C.C.R.</i> , 1385–89, p. 224. <i>Ib.</i> , 1389–92, p. 29. <i>E.A.</i> 402/5, m. 30d. ; 403/10, m. 43d.
Hay, John.	1383–85.	<i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42.
Morers, William.	1383–July, 1390.	<i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42 ; 402/5.
Morieux, Thomas.	1383–85.	<i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42.
Neville, William.	Nov. 23, 1381–July 1390.	<i>C.P.R.</i> 1381–85, pp. 54, 60. <i>Ib.</i> , 1385–89, p. 214. <i>Ib.</i> , 1388–92, p. 214. <i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42 ; 402/5, m. 30d.

Peytevyn, Thomas.	1383-July, 1390.	<i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42 ; 402/5, m. 30d.
Rous, Robert.	May 8, 1381-April 1, 1383.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1377-81, p. 633. <i>C.C.R.</i> , 1377-81, p. 449. <i>Foedera</i> , iv. 167.
Sarnefield, Nicholas.	1383-Sept. 26, 1386.	<i>Foedera</i> , iv. 151. <i>E.A.</i> 401/2, m. 42. <i>C.P.R.</i> , 1385-89, p. 214.
Sedles, Bernard van.	June 12, 1380-Aug. 16, 1382.	<i>Foedera</i> , iv. 90, 104, 117- 118, 151.
Stury, Richard.	May 20-Dec. 16, 1381.	<i>Foedera</i> , iv. 122, 137.
Vache, Philip la.	Feb. 3, 1378-Mar. 1397.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1377-81, pp. 104, 105, 319, 341. <i>Ib.</i> , 1391-96, p. 651. <i>C.C.R.</i> 1396-99, p. 120. <i>E.A.</i> 403/10, m. 43d. <i>Exch. of R., Warr. for I.</i> 10/68.

II

LIST OF ADVANCES FROM THE CHAMBER TO THE EXCHEQUER,
BETWEEN NOVEMBER 1367 AND EASTER 1368
[E.A. 396/8]

M. 1.	Les deniers aprestez a tresorer, hors de la chambre nostre seignur le roi, par les mains Helmyng' Leget, receiunour de la dite chambre, come piert par les parcelles desoutz escriptz.	
		Primerement.
in onere Snayth'	+. Le xxv. iour de Nouembre lan. xlij. par les mains frere Johan Woderoue cc marz. Langele.	
	+. Item daprest au tresorer le viij. iour de Decembre, lan suisdit, par les mains Johan Neue pur linge teil achate, ccc. xiiij. li. xvij. s. Snayth'.	
	+. Item daprest au tresorer le ix iour de Decembre, meisme lan, par les mains le sire de Gomeny pur son fee, c. marz.	
	+. Item daprest au tresorer, par les mains sire Henri Snayth', liure a Thomas Louth, . . . x. li. Snayth'.	
Bretagne	+. Item daprest au tresorer, pur loustel nostre dit seignur et pur louereignes, le xxj. iour de Decembre, par les mayns Derby de deniers de Bretagne, . . . m ^l m ^l . li.	
par garant du priue seal	+. Item daprest au tresorer, pur certaines porthors et messals, achatez le xxvij. iour de Januer meisme lan, lxxiiij. li. Snayth'.	
	+. Item daprest au tresorer, pur la certeine de le fest de Nouel meisme lan, duz en la chambre nostre dit seignur, m ^l m ^l .d marz.	
	Item daprest au tresorer, pur les gentz le seignur de Melan, cestassauer a Petre Leutede, meistre des chiuals le dit seignur, de doun. xxv. marz. Item a Johan, marschall' des ditz chiuals. v. marz. Item as x garsons	
	queux garderont les iiij. destres, iiij. coursers et le mule, xx. li. Item a Bartholomeu Bastard de Virone, fauconer a dit seignur, xxv. marz. Item as. ij portours des faucons de doun. viij. marz, iiij ^{xx} . xiiij. marz. Brantingham, lxij. li.	

Brantyngham

Item daprest autresorer, le xxx. iour de Januer, pur xxv chiuals de Fryse, achatez de Johanne Botyld de Leyston' de Kyrkelerode, xliiij. marz et pur puture des ditz chiuals deuant le dit iour dacate, v. marz. ix. s. iiij d. Item pur les despences, cestassauer en payn, feyn, et autres vitailles pur les ditz chiuals, a le iiij iour du Feuerer, meisme lan, tanqz le xxvij. iour de Feuerer, pur xxiiij iours, prenant pur chescun chiual le iour, iiij d. ob. q^u. xj. li. vij.s. vij. d. q^u. Item en les gages de viij valletz demurantz sur la sauue garde des ditz chiuals par meisme les xxiiij. iours prenant le iour, iiij d., lxj.s. iiij. d. Item en diuerses necessairs, cestassauoir en caneuas et cordes et autres choses, v.s. vj.d. ob. Item en ferrure, iiij.s. iiij.d. Item en medicines pur les ditz chiuals, xvj.s. vd. Item en un chiual alloue pur carier les choses achatez, par xliij. iours, le iour iiij.d., iiij.s. viij d. . . . lxxv. marz. ix.s. ij.d. ob.

pur la viage
deuers Gascoigne
pur le prince, etc.

Item au dit tresorer, daprest, le ij. iour de Feuerer, lan suisdit par les mains Robert de Crull', cl. li. ix.s. Item par les mains le dit Robert, pur deniers liurez a Roy-naud' Ferrers, meisme le iour daprest, xx. marz. Item au dit sire Robert meisme le iour daprest au tresorer, lx.s.

clx. vj. li. xv. s.
viiij. d.

Item daprest au dit tresorer, par les mains William Assenden', meisme le iour, xiiij. li. vj.s. viij.d. Item daprest au dit tresorer, par les mains Johan Clerc' de Hampton', meisme le iour, xiiij. li. vj.s. viij.d. Item au dit tresorer daprest, par les mains Geoffrey Stukele meisme le iour, xl li. iiij^ml d. xj li. ijs. xd. ob. +. Item pur la certeine du terme de Pasqe, lan susdit, . . . m^l.m^l.d marz. vj^ml. ij^c. lxxvij. li. xvj.s. ij.d. ob.

M. 2.

Iste particule suprascripte soluuntur in cameram domini regis per thesaurarium et camerarios per manus predicti Helmyngi et intrantur in pelle memorandum de recepta scaccarii, vj^{to} die Maij, anno xlij^{do}.

La somme totale appreste au tresorer amonte, vj^ml. ij^c. lxxvij. li. xvj.s. ij.d. ob. qe font en marz, ix^ml. iiij^c. xvj. marz. ix.s. vj.d. ob.

CHAPTER XIV

THE GREAT WARDROBE

THE earliest appearance I have found of the imposing term *magna garderoba* is in a writ close, under the date February 7, 1253.¹ The regular official use of the term began five years later, in the wardrobe accounts of Aubrey of Fécamp and Peter of Winchester, which range from 1258 to 1261.² The details of these accounts show that the functions of the institution so designated were already determined upon lines which were never materially departed from in the whole of its later history. Examination of still earlier documents proves that the thing was in existence some time before it received its definitive name, and that, from the first year of the reign of Henry III., there was a special branch of the wardrobe, whose essential concern was the purchase and provision of such requisites for the household as could be stored for a considerable period.

Before describing this organisation in detail, it will be as well to emphasise the fact that in its origin, and for the first century and a half of its history, the great wardrobe was only a department of the king's wardrobe. Although it was natural enough that people should think a "great wardrobe" was necessarily more important than a plain "wardrobe," the contrary was the case. It is not fanciful to believe that this department

¹ *C.R.* 66/18d., 37 Hen. III. See below, p. 364, n. 1. There is a "contra-breue" enrolled in the Liberate Roll (*C. Lib. R.* i. 383), dated May 18, 1239, which orders the construction of a fireplace "in the king's great wardrobe at Woodstock." This refers clearly to the wardrobe in the sense of a room, not in the sense of an office. It was simply a room of unusual size used for wardrobe purposes. Compare *ib.* p. 417, which orders a wardrobe 30 feet long to be built for the king at Clarendon in the same year. Compare *C.R.*, 1247-51, p. 201, which shows that there was in 1249 a "garderoba regis" in the Tower of London. See for this, pp. 358, 361, n. 2, below.

² *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 1/1d., 42-45 Hen. III.

was called "the great wardrobe," because of the bulkiness of the commodities with which it dealt, and not because it was an office of "great" importance. In short, "great" indicated the size, and not the dignity, of the office. Inattention to this circumstance has often led scholars of repute into loosely describing the wardrobe itself, which they knew to be the main thing, as the great wardrobe, and even to attributing to the great wardrobe the supreme place in the wardrobe system.¹

The need of a great wardrobe is clearly to be found in the practical distinction, which all good housekeepers must make, between the perishable articles which have to be purchased on the spot and rapidly used, and the storable commodities, which can be bought in large quantities, wherever they may be most cheaply obtained, and laid aside until they are wanted.

The thrifty country housewife of modern times buys her meat, her bread and dairy produce in the village, but lays in a stock of groceries, clothing and linen from the "stores," or the big shops of the nearest large town. The officers of the household of a mediaeval king or baron found much greater difficulties in catering for their master's wants than those which face the modern housekeeper, dwelling in the most remote of rural par-

¹ For instance, the last edition of Mr. Scargill-Bird's valuable *Guide to the Public Records* put the great wardrobe first, when it told us how the king's wardrobe was "subsequently subdivided into a great wardrobe, a wardrobe of the household, and a privy wardrobe" (p. 246, ed. 1908). Mr. Bird also spoke of the "issues of the great wardrobe" being classified under twelve heads (*ib.* p. 247) when it is clear that he was speaking of what, in the fourteenth century, was called the "wardrobe of the household." His work is now replaced by Mr. Giuseppi's *Guide to the Manuscripts in the Public Record Office*, of which vol. i., *Legal Records, etc.*, appeared in 1923 and vol. ii. in 1924. The misleading explanations quoted above are rightly suppressed, but little is substituted for them, and it is not made clear why such wardrobe records as exist survive in the archives of the exchequer and chancery, or wherein the distinction between the three wardrobes lies. Some expressions, for instance the statement in i. 191, that "wardrobe debentures" are "notes of sums owing in the great wardrobe," suggest that the author has not quite cleared his mind of Mr. Bird's categories. The majority of wardrobe debentures record obligations to the "wardrobe of the household." Similar errors are widely spread. So admirable a scholar as the late Mary Bateson made a like confusion, and even suggested that the "keeper of the wardrobe" was a different person from its treasurer; *Mediaeval England*, pp. 284-285, where an excellent summary of the Household Ordinance of 1279 is given. A similar ambiguity necessitates the use of caution in consulting a large proportion of the indexes of the *Calendars* of patent and close rolls, which, for all their shortcomings, so enormously lighten the labours of those engaged in the study of mediaeval history. Most of the more recent indexes show a great improvement in this respect.

sonages or country houses. Like their modern counterparts, the king's servants solved some of their problems by separating storable goods from those for immediate consumption, and came to differentiate the province of the *hospicium regis* from that of the storehouse, or *magna garderoba*.¹

The expenses of the *hospicium* and those of the *magna garderoba* were first recorded under such terms in the accounts of Henry of Ghent, 1261-64.² The *hospicium* purchased, or seized, the food, firing, beverages, forage and the other daily household necessities for the king and his court. Articles which would keep for any length of time, and which were not, as a rule, consumed in a single use, came within the purview of the great wardrobe.³ Such articles included furniture and equipment, tapestry and hangings for rooms, wearing apparel, cloth, silk,

¹ This is strikingly illustrated by *Les Reules Seynt Roberd*, made by Grosse-teste for the governance of the lands and household of the countess of Lincoln: "Ioe lo ke a deus seisouns del an facez vos graunt achaz, coe est vos vins e vostre cire e vostre garderobe a la feire de seynt Botulf"; Walter of Henley's *Husbandry*, etc., ed. Lamond, p. 144. For the baron, as for the king, the ideal was to "live of his own" for his daily wants, and to buy his "stock" to the best advantage at the great fairs.

² *Pipe*, 113/2, 53 H. III., which speaks of a sum "quod totum debetur diuersis tam pro hospicio regis quam pro magna garderoba." Sir James Ramsay (*Antiquary*, vi. 103) rightly emphasises the function of the great wardrobe as a storehouse, but in calling it "primarily a depot of clothing" he somewhat minimises its sphere. A depot of clothing would have had no need to spend the large sums which went through the office of the great wardrobe.

³ The relative spheres of the "hospicium" and the "magna garderoba" stand out clearly in the clause limiting prises contained in *Articuli super cartas*, pp. 101-103, ed. Bémont, *Chartes des libertés anglaises*. This distinguished (a) "prises pur l'ostel le roi," for which it provided that the "prenours, purveours" and "achatours" must have with them a warrant under the great or the small seal, and (b) "prises en feires et en bones villes et portz pur la grant garderobe le roi," for which it ordered "eient les prenours leur commun garant par le grant seal, e des choses q'il prendront eient la tesmoignance du seal du gardein de la garderobe." It is interesting that the small seal, which was a sufficient warranty for prises for the "hospicium," was not regarded as adequate for prises for the great wardrobe. Notice also the subordination of the great wardrobe to the keeper of the wardrobe, whose seal was required to witness each prise. Some interesting records of the fair court of St. Ives, published in Gross' *Select Cases on the Law Merchant*, i. 76 (Selden Soc., 1908), show, in May 1300, the procedure actually taken by Ralph Stokes, Edward I.'s "clericus ad capiendum prisas," in other words, keeper of the great wardrobe. Stokes produced in the fair court a "common warrant," drawn up as a letter patent under the great seal, authorising him to purchase wares "for the great wardrobe." He also produced a "letter patent under secret (i.e. privy) seal," ordering all persons to deliver to him the goods he required, and a letter patent of the keeper of the wardrobe, Droxford, addressed to the bailiff of the fair, specifying the amount and manner of the prises desired, and the method of registering them by indenture.

canvas, furs and the like. The important *liberaciones robarum*, to which all members of the household were periodically entitled, were discharged from this office, as were the liveries of cloth of gold, furs, carpets, silk, satin, velvet and other luxuries, as well as the king's gifts of similar articles.¹ The great wardrobe also provided wax for lighting and for sealing for the chancery, the household, and for the privy seal.² It also procured for the king's use "groceries," spices, pepper, sugar, figs, ginger, raisins, drugs, dried fruit, sulphur, saltpetre and other storable goods of luxury and necessity. Like the *hospicium*, it often obtained what it wanted by levying prises on the king's subjects.

As time went on, the king's needs became greater, and the great wardrobe had occasion to enlarge its functions. From dress to plate and jewels, or from clothes to armour, or from armour to arms, was a small step. Accordingly, we find the great wardrobe purchasing, storing, repairing and making, plate and jewelry, all sorts of arms and armour, tents, flags, saddles, harness and other such articles.³ For a brief period the great wardrobe was charged with the provision of sulphur and saltpetre, the rarer and more costly ingredients of gunpowder; and later even lead,⁴ brass and other metals were procured by the great wardrobe for the fabrication of ammunition and artillery. We shall see the importance of these activities when we come to the staffing of the great wardrobe in the fourteenth century, and to its

¹ For examples of these, see n. 3, below.

² Cf. *E.A.* 387/6, a receipt of John Offord, chancellor, for 500 lbs. of wax from John Cook, keeper of the great wardrobe, Dec. 2, 1347.

³ See for an early instance *Chanc. Misc.* 3/11, "rotulus de minutis particulis," of Adenettus, the king's tailor and buyer of the wardrobe, 3-8 Edw. I., which includes items such as shears, iron caps, helmets, standards, tents, etc. The detailed enumeration of great wardrobe activities in *L.Q.G.* pp. 354-355 shows the subordination of the arms and armour to the vital matters of the office. For a later instance, see Norwell's account, 9-10 Edw. III. in *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/5. A useful summary of the goods in which the developed great wardrobe of the early fourteenth century dealt is contained in *E.A.* 353/7, a contract between Droxford, keeper of the wardrobe, and the Ballardi, dated 32 Edw. I. The commodities enumerated are woollen cloth, fur, napery, linen, "carde," canvas, sandal and other silks, carpets, bankers (bench covers), wax, almonds, rice, figs, raisins, dates, ginger, cinnamon, galingale (oriental roots used in cookery and medicine), sugar, saffron and other spices. I am indebted to Mr. C. Johnson for calling my attention to this passage. We have only to add metals, sulphur and saltpetre to complete the list for the later period.

⁴ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/44-46. See *Archaeologia*, xxxii. 381-382, and my "Fire Arms in England in the Fourteenth Century," in *E.H.R.* xxvi, especially pp. 690-691.

manufacturing functions. Such aspects of the great wardrobe were always subsidiary, and, early in the fourteenth century, the arms and armour department became a separate institution, called the privy wardrobe of the Tower. This ultimately resulted in the limitation of the great wardrobe to a narrower sphere. Yet, to the end of our period, there were still appointed king's goldsmiths at the great wardrobe,¹ and it was only gradually that the great wardrobe ceased to be the factory, and repairing shop, of such articles as arms and armour, tents and saddlery.

The great wardrobe, then, was primarily a storehouse for the court. The need of such was felt the more acutely, because the wardrobe, though itself a store in origin, had become in the course of the thirteenth century a considerable accounting, financial and administrative organisation. There was a real distinction in quality between the higher and newer and the older and humbler work of the wardrobe, and it was essential to draw a clear division between the two, lest the mechanical work of storage and safe-keeping should be neglected by reason of the absorption of the officers of the wardrobe in the more difficult business of their department. Nor was the wardrobe the only office of the court to which these considerations applied. The king's chamber, like the king's wardrobe, had developed, at an even earlier date, the same twofold activity, the same distinction between finance and administration as opposed to custody and storage. Though wardrobe and chamber were separate entities, their work was similar and often overlapped. The great wardrobe, then, a special organisation of a simple sort, served to discharge some of the original functions of both the wardrobe and the chamber of the Angevins. The development set free the wardrobe proper to do the clerical and administrative work of the king's court, and when the work of the great wardrobe became more complex, it was, in its turn, to send out an offshoot of its own, in the privy wardrobe.

Another circumstance which called the great wardrobe into being was the fact that the needs of a store differed from the needs of an office. We have, then, to consider not only the types and qualities of wardrobe and chamber work, but the places in which that work could best be done. A court office under

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, pp. 319, 332.

thirteenth century conditions was necessarily itinerant, but it became a waste of money and energy to drag about the country the long caravan¹ which, at first, conveyed from place to place the paraphernalia of articles, whether or not they were wanted for immediate use. It was much more convenient to have a storehouse in fixed quarters, and, as mere stationary storehouses for an itinerating wardrobe were unsatisfactory, there was, from an early time, a tendency to establish the great wardrobe storehouse in one definite place. Otherwise, even under mediaeval conditions, the work could not have been done at all.

We may, in a fashion, trace back to the Angevin period the germ of the great wardrobe, for the pipe rolls of Henry II. constantly record the purchase by the wardrobe, for the king's chamber, of such articles as cloth, silk, and furs.² There is no definite evidence that these "great wardrobe articles" were separately dealt with by a special household department until we get to the reign of John, when William, the king's tailor, had an account of his own.³ Even more clearly we can discern it in the special commissions, which from the early part of Henry III.'s reign were given to various officers of the court to go to fairs to purchase cloth, wax, spices and similar commodities for the king's use. Thus, in 1223, William of Haverhill, a wardrobe clerk, who was "controller" from 1234 to 1236, and later treasurer of the exchequer, was associated with William the Tailor, that is, the king's tailor, to buy robes for the king at St. Ives fair,⁴ and, the next year, to discharge the same duty at Winchester fair.⁵ These are the first of a large number of such commissions, and the constant association of those two persons suggests, if not a definite office, at least some special duty in this particular

¹ "Carauanna," a word brought back from the east by the crusaders, and variously spelt, is of constant occurrence in early wardrobe accounts, for instance, *L.Q.G.* p. 84. Topham defines it as what was later called "the removing wardrobe," *ib.* p. xxxviii.

² See, for instance, above, i. 108 and 115, and also *Pipe*, 23 *Henry II.* p. 105. "Et pro pannis liberatis in camera regis"; *ib.* 24 *Hen. II.* p. 128, "Et pro ij palliis de escarlata, et ij cappis escariate, et ij pelliciis grissiis, et j culcitra perpuncta ad opus regine et puelle sue . . . per visum Edwardi camerarii"; *ib.* 30 *Hen. II.* p. 154, "Edwardo (Blundo) . . . pro pannis familie regis."

³ *Rotulus Misae*, 11 *John*, in *Rotuli de Liberate, etc. regnante Johanne*, p. 170.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1216-25, p. 372.

⁵ *Rot. Lit. Claus.* i. 619 (Sept. 6, 1224).

relation.¹ Eight years later, we find the same pair ordered to buy, at Northampton fair, robes for the use of the knights, clerks and servants of the king's household.²

The writs which record the commissions to purchase are in no case patents of appointment. They are "writs of aid", addressed to the officers charged with holding fairs, to bailiffs of towns or to other persons who were in various ways in a position to facilitate the buyers' work, requesting their help for men already appointed by the king. The same two persons received mandates to seize at the ports goods for the king's use. Their last commission, in 1237, was of this nature for the port of Sandwich, and the prise was effected by the view and testimony of four law-worthy men of the town.³

The commissions were the starting-point of the great wardrobe as an organisation. Those issued to Haverhill and William were accompanied by special powers to draw from the exchequer sums needful for their purchases and their transport, apart from the moneys which the keepers of the wardrobe were in the habit of receiving from this source. The writs of *liberate* directing the exchequer to pay out moneys to Haverhill and William are equally significant.⁴ The buyers of cloth for the king were not, then, wholly dependent on the wardrobe for supplies; they had finances, as well as an embryo organisation of their own.

As time went on, the commissions became more specific. One of the agents was nearly always the king's tailor, who, of course, had a peculiarly intimate interest in the purchases. William the Tailor was a substantial man, a landowner,⁵ a benefactor of the Friars Minor of London,⁶ and keeper of the mint at Canterbury.⁷

¹ For example, *C.P.R.*, 1216-25, pp. 435-436; *C.C.R.*, 1231-34, pp. 4, 41, 43, and many other examples.

² *C.C.R.*, 1231-34, p. 1.

³ *Ib.*, 1234-37, p. 424. The list of articles is instructive as covering the whole field of later great wardrobe activities.

⁴ *C.Lib.R.* i. 31, 38, 60, 75, 84, 89, 110, 139, 170, 191, 274. These range from 1226 to 1236. *Ib.* 170 shows amongst the purchases, not only cloth, but other "great wardrobe" commodities, almonds, wax, rice, raisins and figs.

⁵ See, for instance, *C.Ch.R.* i. 257, which shows that William held lands of the king's gift, "by rendering yearly at Christmas the scissors due from the said William." Compare *C.R.*, 1237-42, p. 255.

⁶ Fr. Thomas, *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Anglia*, p. 163, ed. Little, 1909.

⁷ He was appointed to the Canterbury Mint on Feb. 24, 1230; *C.C.R.*, 1227-31, p. 300. For his lands and his work as moneyer see *ib.* pp. 42, 350; *ib.*, 1231-34, p. 481; and *C.P.R.*, 1232-47, p. 191. I feel fairly sure that this William was the same person as William the king's tailor under John.

Elsewhere he is described as "king's sergeant." About 1238 he disappeared from court,¹ and was succeeded by Roger de Ros,² more often called from his function Roger, or Master Roger, the Tailor, who remained in office until his death in 1257.³ Roger was an even more important man than William, and his sphere soon expanded beyond the custody of cloth and the making of clothes. So early as 1242 he was associated in general wardrobe work with Peter Chaceporc, keeper of the wardrobe,⁴ and was literate enough to be "bound to the king" in accounts, reckonings and debts.⁵ Though he was Chaceporc's subordinate, even for definitely "great wardrobe work," his office gradually became a separate charge, called, before long, the office of buyer of the wardrobe.⁶ It was in this capacity of "buyer" that Roger, in 1243, went so far afield in his quest of cloths as the great fair of Provins in Champagne.⁷

Further developments soon followed. Before the end of 1243, Roger not only made and distributed clothes, but had the official custody of the king's cloth.⁸ Slowly there grew up what we may call a clothing department of the wardrobe, from which the customary liveries of robes and furs to the king's household were issued. In the beginning, this distribution was one of the duties of the keeper of the wardrobe, but in 1247 Peter Chaceporc, then keeper of the wardrobe, was found to be too busy to discharge it personally. Accordingly, on December 6, with a view to the lavish issue of robes for Christmas, William Hardel and

¹ *C.Lib.R.* i. 247 gives the last "liberate" to him and Haverhill on Dec. 3, 1236. On Aug. 4, 1237, William received a small grant for life, which suggests the possibility of retirement; *C.P.R.*, 1232-47, p. 191. But he had another grant in 1238; *C.R.*, 1237-42, pp. 81-82. This is the last mention of him that I have found, though he may well have been the William the Tailor who, in 1242, was removed from the office of coroner of Kent on the ground of his insufficiency; *ib.* p. 467.

² Roger had, on Dec. 6, 1240, a grant of land "to hold by rendering at the exchequer a silver bodkin or 1d. yearly"; *C.Ch.R.* i. 255. In 1342 he was "Master Roger"; *C.R.*, 1242-47, p. 7. He was not the only king's tailor. "Mansellus, scissor noster" of London was, for instance, also acting in 1246; *ib.* p. 431.

³ Roger was already dead on Aug. 27, 1257; *C.R.* 72/3.

⁴ *C.R.*, 1242-47, p. 4.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1247-58, p. 629.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 620 says "emptor garderober"; *C.R.* 72/3, says "captor."

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1232-47, p. 373; *R.G.* i. 125. The king was afraid to send with Roger sufficient money for his purchases on account of the danger of the roads, so he asked a clerk of the count of Flanders to mainprise him. But Henry III. was then in Gascony and so was the great wardrobe.

⁸ *C.R.*, 1242-47, p. 141: "de pannis regis qui sunt in custodia vestra."

William Duplessis were specially appointed to perform this task.¹ Hardel was keeper of the Tower exchange² and Duplessis was chamberlain of wines,³ so that London was the natural working sphere of both. The close rolls are full of mandates to them to deliver cloth and robes to officers of the court,⁴ and the deliveries are expressly stated to have been made out of the wardrobe. Indeed, Duplessis was in one writ of 1249 actually called "keeper of the king's wardrobe."⁵ He died in August of that year,⁶ whereupon this work of distribution was transferred to Roger the Tailor.⁷

The English craftsman of the thirteenth century was not good at keeping accounts, and in spite of some claim to literacy, Roger, while occasionally acting alone, seems to have required, at times, the assistance of a clerk to help him draw up his accounts and make his purchases; hence the frequent association with him of clerks of the wardrobe. As early as 1243 and 1245 a clerk named John was working under him.⁸ In 1250 John of Somercoats, king's clerk, acted jointly with Roger in making prises,⁹ was one of his *socii* in 1253, along with Richard of Sherburn,¹⁰ and was still serving in 1255.¹¹ In 1254 Roger's clerk was Robert of Linton,¹² who, although called clerk of Roger the Tailor, was also an officer of the wardrobe.¹³ Later, in 1256, Roger had the help of Hugh of the Tower, another king's clerk of whom we shall hear more, who bought with him at Boston fair, when both

¹ *C.R.*, 1247-51, p. 12: "Quia P. Chacepore . . . ad presens . . . vacare non potest . . . mandatum est Willelmo Hardel quod liberacioni robarum illarum una cum Willelmo de Plessetis intendat."

² *Ib.* pp. 67, 113.

³ *Ib.* pp. 139, 159, 160.

⁴ *Ib.*, 1247-51, pp. 15-16, contains twelve such entries.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 157, a mandate of Apr. 28 to the mayor and good men of Lincoln to carry certain cloth to London for Whitsuntide "liberandos ibidem W. de Plessetis, custodi garderobe nostre."

⁶ He was dead before Aug. 26, when his lands were seized by the king as security for his debts; *ib.* p. 215, but a mandate was issued to him so late as Aug. 2; *ib.* p. 189.

⁷ He made such liveries from Oct. 1249; *ib.* p. 206.

⁸ *C.R.*, 1243-47, pp. 15, 342.

⁹ *Ib.*, 1247-51, p. 268.

¹⁰ *Ib.* 66/18d., 37 Henry III.

¹¹ *Ib.* 69/12, 39 Henry III.

¹² *R.G.* i. 433: "Robertus de Lintone, clericus Rogeri cissoris" (Oct. 1254). Robert accompanied Henry III. to Gascony in 1253-54 as a wardrobe officer; cf. *ib.* i. 531. He was not the Robert of Linton who was sheriff of London in 1254; *Lib. de Ant. Leg.*, pp. 20, 224. See below, pp. 366-367.

¹³ He was probably the Robert de Linton called "clericus garderobe regine" on Feb. 4, 1239; *Lib.R.* 13/21, 23 Hen. III.; *C.Lib.R.* i. 364.

of them, like Duplessis before them, were described as keepers of the king's wardrobe.¹

Roger's position was strong enough to make him the head of a subordinate wardrobe department especially charged with the care of what, before long, were called "great wardrobe articles."² He still followed the court, being both in 1242-43 and in 1253-54 in attendance on the king in Gascony. In 1253-54 he was associated, in the provision of robes, with two wardrobe clerks, Bonacius the Lombard³ and the better known Aubrey of Fécamp, who is described in 1254 as *custos garderobe regis*.⁴ This is not technically correct, because Peter Chacepore and Artaud of Saint-Romain were at that time successively keepers of the wardrobe in the larger sense of the term. We can, therefore, only explain the extension of the title of keeper to subordinate clerks by recognising that there was already, so to say, a wardrobe within the wardrobe, the lesser one being clearly the office and store-house for cloth, wax, dried fruit and other such commodities. The great general responsibilities thrown upon Chacepore and the wardrobe, during these sojourns abroad, doubtless quickened the consolidation of Roger's department into a distinct office. Although more often spoken of as "the part of the wardrobe in the custody of Roger the Tailor,"⁵ it was, in fact, in 1253, beginning to be called the "great wardrobe." The nature of its contents, the name of its keeper, the place of its location are in

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1247-58, p. 483.

² In the index to *C.R.*, 1247-51, attention is rightly drawn to the enormous number of liveries; but the index heading "Liveries out of the great wardrobe," pp. 656-657, is in no case justified. Such "anticipations of history" are misleading.

³ *R.G.* i. *passim*. He is also called "Bonacius Lombardi," "Bonacursus" and "Bonacus." See index to supplement of *R.G.* i. 77. He remained with Roger joint "taker" of the wardrobe in 1255, after the king's return; *C.P.R.*, 1247-58, p. 404. See also above, i. 273-275.

⁴ *R.G.* i. 436 (after Dec. 21, 1254). I have suggested elsewhere (see i. 277-278) a possible explanation why Aubrey was so called in Dec. 1254. But the only reason why the others should be called keepers seems that now given in the text.

⁵ *Lib. R.* 29/3; 37 Hen. III: "rex vicecomitibus London. salutem. Precipimus vobis quod garderobam nostram, que est in custodia Rogeri le Taillur, seruientis nostri, carriari facias usque Wintoniam sine dilacione" (June 13, 1253). For another variant see n. 4, p. 362 below. This usage persisted at least until the middle part of the reign of Edward I., for in 1286-89 we read of the "sumetarii de garderoba Adinetti" (i.e. of the great wardrobe) as distinguished from the "sumetarii de garderoba regis"; *M.B.E.*, *T. of R.*, 201/83.

themselves sufficient to prevent this specialised wardrobe of stored goods being confused with the wardrobe proper. Though "buyer" was the ordinary title of its chiefs, their work was not ended when they had completed their purchases. They had to look after what they had bought, and to direct the office which assisted them both in buying and in keeping. Though hardly ever called keeper, the buyer was often described as having the custody of the office.

In six different ways a certain independence of the main wardrobe organisation was gradually attained. To begin with, the articles with which Roger, Hugh, Robert and their associates were concerned, had, for twenty years, been grouped together by themselves, in a separate section of the accounts. The wardrobe account of Walter of Kirkham, 1234-36, issued by Haverhill's view and testimony, treated of the cloth, furs and similar store commodities, apart from the other accountable articles.¹ In the next account the "wine, wax and spices of the store" were even more clearly distinguished from the ordinary expenses of the royal household.² The same phrase constantly recurs in later accounts, as for example those of 1257-61.³ This is the account in which the great wardrobe is first mentioned by that name, as particularly connected with cloth, fur, silk, wax and the like.⁴

¹ *Pipe*, 79/11, 19 Hen. III., gives Kirkham's main account. At the end is written: "respicie residuum huius compoti post Suthampton, quia non erat hic locus." Room was found on *ib.* m. 5d, which treats of cloth, furs and other great wardrobe commodities.

² *Pipe*, 81/13, 21 H. III.: "expense domus regis . . . preter vinum, ceram et speciarium de instaurro." A special item as to the charges for cloth, linen, sugar and the like follow. Compare above, p. 355, n. 4. This shows that spices and dried fruits were already great wardrobe articles under William the Tailor. Compare also *C.Lib.R.* i. 364, a writ ordering Roger to view the raisins, dates and figs in a "chamber of the tower of Winchester where the king's wardrobe is deposited." Roger was to load a cart with these and convey them to the king at Westminster. Here we have already a localised great wardrobe store. This was on Feb. 1, 1239.

³ *Enr. Accs. (W. and H.)*, 1, 42-45 H. III.

⁴ *Ib.* m. 1d: "de pannis, pelluris, cendallis, cera et aliis pertinenciis ad magnam garderobam." The next few lines, where the details and amounts of these great wardrobe expenses should follow, are, unluckily, left blank in the parchment. Attention should, however, be drawn to the fact that this first "enrolled account" consists of two membranes only, and that each membrane substantially covers the same ground, being the accounts of Aubrey of Fécamp and Peter of Winchester for the period above mentioned. They are not, however, mere duplicates. Membrane 2 differs from membrane 1, in including in the total of receipts the "great wardrobe accounts" of the "buyers," Richard of Ewell and Hugh of the Tower, which in m. 1 figure only at the end as a separate account. This is in itself another indication of the growing separation of the "great wardrobe items" from the ordinary expenses of the "hospicium."

Henceforth the "things appertaining to the great wardrobe," for some generations still included in the wardrobe accounts, nevertheless had in them a special place of their own.

The second circumstance was that special storehouses had been provided for the articles for which the great wardrobe was becoming responsible. The ordinary wardrobe followed the court, but for the bulky commodities, purchased at the great fairs by the king's buyers, convenient storehouses, or wardrobes, were set up, often in the neighbourhoods in which the articles were purchased. For instance, the prior of St. Ives was ordered, in 1242, to make a wardrobe in his priory for the cloth, and other things, bought in the fair at that place,¹ famous all over England as the best market for cloth,² and so regularly attended by the buyers of the wardrobe that a permanent storehouse under ecclesiastical protection had become necessary.³ This wardrobe of St. Ives is the earliest instance we know, of what would afterwards have been called a great wardrobe in the local sense. The "buyers'" department still, of course, followed the court, as witness the presence in Gascony, in 1242-43 and 1254-55, of all those persons specially connected with the buying of stores.

Not only were there these local storehouses, and a great wardrobe itinerating with the court. A central distributing warehouse was soon needed, where purchases from various districts could be collected and forwarded from time to time to wherever the court happened to be. This consideration was the

¹ *R.G.* i. 19 (Oct. 14, 1242): "Mandatum est . . . quod faciat habere priori de Sancto Ivone decem quercus . . . ad unam garderobam faciendam in prioratu suo, ad pannos et alias res regis emptas in nundinis, ibidem reponendas." In 1223 the prior had already been ordered "quod domum bonam et securam infra prioratum suum eis commodari faciat, ad robas domini regis et alia que in illis nundinis ement (sc. W. de Haverhull et W. Talliator regis) ad opus domini regis in eadem domo ponenda"; *P.R.*, 1216-25, p. 372.

² "Vez robes achatez a seynt Yue" was Grosseteste's advice to the countess of Lincoln; Walter of Henley, p. 144; cf. Gross, *Select Cases on the Law Merchant*, p. xxxiii (Selden Society, 1908). Sometimes goods could not be procured even there. See *C.R.*, 1237-42, p. 189, an order of May 11, 1240, of the king to Haverhill, then treasurer of the exchequer, to provide 250 "cindalla ad robas nostras" before Whitsuntide, as the king had heard there were none at St. Ives fair.

³ There are constant references in the roll to royal purchases made at these fairs, e.g. *C.R.* 69/12: "quia Johannes de Somerkote interfuit empconibus et prisis pannorum in nundinis sancti Iuonis, mandatum est eidem Rogero (*i.e.* Scissori) quod ad liberationes inde faciendas ipsum Johannem in socium suum ad hoc admittat" (May 24, 1255).

third cause of the erection of the great wardrobe into a separate department. Thus, in 1239, there was a store of great wardrobe commodities in a chamber of the tower of the king's castle at Winchester, whence the court, when at Westminster, was supplied with raisins, dates and figs by the cartload.¹ London, however, was found to be most convenient for such a distributing centre, the more so since it was easy to combine with a depository there, a resting-place for the itinerating wardrobe when the court was in or near the capital. Towards the middle of the thirteenth century, therefore, the Tower of London became the normal place of storage for great wardrobe goods. We learn that such a wardrobe was at the Tower of London in September 1249, and that the king himself had the custody of its keys. When, for instance, wax was needed from that store, the king sent one of his servants, accompanied by a royal clerk, who had with him the keys which the king had formally delivered to him under the royal seal.² Even when the king was in Gascony a stock of robes was kept on the north side of the channel.³ In 1257 the first duty of those newly appointed to the custody of the wardrobe stores was personally to visit the Tower to inspect "the state of the king's wardrobe there."⁴ From this point of view it is significant that the royal clerk who had the longest connection with the great wardrobe under Henry III. derived his surname from the fortress where the stores were commonly deposited. He was that Hugh of the Tower who can be proved to have been constantly occupied in "great wardrobe" business

¹ *C.Lib.R.* i. 364.

² *C.R.*, 1247-51, pp. 201-202: "Mandatum est Edwardo de Westmonasterio quod una cum Andrea Poynant, clerico regis, eat ad Turrim Londonie, et a garderoba regis extrahat unum miliare cere, et illud liberet eidem Andree, regi deferendum ad expensas suas. Et claves quas rex ei mittit sub sigillo suo, ei remittat sub sigillo suo per eundem Andream" (Sept. 21, 1249).

³ *R.G.* i. 417. The phrase "omnes pannos sericos . . . et totam pelluram quam habetis in custodia vestra citra mare" clearly suggests this. This English store was replenished by exchequer officers against the king's return; *ib.* i. 426.

⁴ *C.R.* 72/3: "Quia Rogerus le Taylor, quondam emptor garderobe regis, concessit in fata, rex vult quod Ricardus de Ewell, loco predicti Rogeri una cum Hugone de Turri, intendat captioni garderobe predicte, donec rex aliter inde ordinaverit. Et mandatum est eidem Ricardo quod, assumpto secum predicto Hugone, personaliter accedat ad Turrim Londonie ad videndum statum garderobe regis, et una cum eodem Hugone intendat hiis que ad captionem garderobe predicte pertinent. Et mandatum est predicto Hugoni quod ipsum Ricardum in socium ad hoc admittat" (Aug. 27, 1257).

from 1236 to 1268.¹ Even the closely recurring revolutions and reactions of the years 1258-65 failed to dislodge this stolid official from his position.

Headquarters at the Tower were compatible not only with the great wardrobe itinerating with the court, but also with what seems like the bodily transference of the whole establishment from London, when the court took up its abode for a considerable time at a place some distance from it. For instance, on June 14, 1253, the sheriffs of London were ordered to transport the "king's wardrobe in the custody of Roger the Tailor" from London to Winchester.² During the long visits to Gascony in 1254-55, the great wardrobe had a permanent abode in a tower in Bordeaux.³ A "part of it," that is, one imagines, another storehouse of great wardrobe commodities, was also established at Bayonne under the custody of one of Roger's servants.⁴ Besides this, there was always the main office itself with its staff, which followed the king from one Gascon town to another. On the return from Gascony, late in October 1254, the wardrobe was sent from Bayonne and Bordeaux to Witsand by sea, where it apparently awaited Henry's arrival in that region.⁵ In 1257, when the king was occupied with the Welsh campaign, the "wardrobe of wax" was in Chester castle, and was opened with the same formality as in 1249 at the Tower.⁶

A fourth circumstance, by which the separation of the two wardrobes was facilitated, was that the keeper of the main wardrobe was allowed to disclaim responsibility for some of the acts of the king's buyers and takers. Until the middle of the

¹ For Hugh, see also above, i. 300, 312.

² See above, p. 358, n. 5.

³ *R.G.* i. 437, mandate to Roger the Tailor and William of Axmouth: "quod garderobam regis poni faciant in turri illa apud Burdegalam ubi fuit alias quando fuit in partibus illis." F. Michel (*ib.* i. xxiii-v) describes the "garderoba domini principis" of the "rue des Ayres," Bordeaux, in 1375; cf. Drouyn, *Bordeaux vers 1450*.

⁴ *R.G.* i. 433, 434. It was "residuum garderobe regis quod remansit apud Baionam post recessum Edwardi filii regis."

⁵ *Ib.* i. 436. The delay was "per defectum nauium."

⁶ *C.R.* 73/3, 42 Hen. III.: "Quia rex ad presens indigit cera et quibusdam aliis que in garderoba regis in castro Cestrie, quum rex ultimo esset ibidem, deposita fuerunt, sub sigillo Philippi Louel, thesaurarii, et Petri de Wintonia, clerici garderobe regis, mandatum est Rogero de Monte Alto, justiciario Cestrie, quod Nicholao, ostiario garderobe regis, quem rex mittit ad eum cum clauis dictae garderobe ipsam garderobam aperire, et ceram et alia que regi ad presens fuerint necessaria, extrahi permittat ad regem carianda."

century, we find general wardrobe officers called upon to provide robes, cloth, boots and other great wardrobe materials equally with the "buyers," whose peculiar business it was.¹ But as early as 1250, the king granted to Peter Chaceporc, keeper of the wardrobe, that he should be bound to render account for the doings and prises of Roger the Tailor and his fellows, only as regards what was delivered by them into the wardrobe.² As head of the department, Chaceporc was accountable for what the buyers handed in to him, but he was anxious not to be answerable for such prises as the buyers appropriated for themselves, or for any accompanying oppressive acts. While Henry III. was in Gascony in 1253-54, Chaceporc, though often issuing robes from store, had nothing to do with the buyings of the wardrobe; they were the exclusive concern of Aubrey of Fécamp, Roger the Tailor and Bonacius Lombard. More often than not, too, the buyers of the robes were also the persons called upon to make liveries of them.³

At the time of Henry III.'s 1242-43 Gascon expedition, there seemed considerable confusion between the "great wardrobe" and the main wardrobe. Yet when the king went to Gascony in 1254-55, there was a clear distinction between them, for the intervening period had permitted a rapid growth in the process of differentiation. Sometimes local traders, as well as the king's buyers, were appointed to buy cloth and the like for the king's use. They also had to be protected from the interference of the king's tailor.⁴ Roger's activity seems to have been more profitable to himself than to the crown, for, after his death in 1257, the king's tailor was not, for a time, associated with the king's buyers. Perhaps it was part of the 1258 baronial policy to avoid giving so responsible a position to a tradesman who could make personal gain out of it.

A fifth and fundamental cause of the great wardrobe's semi-independence of the wardrobe proper emerged when the "buyers" and "keepers" of the former began to account separately at the

¹ For examples see *C.R.*, 1237-42, pp. 16, 301. On *ib.* p. 189, the treasurer of the exchequer was ordered to buy cloth.

² *C.P.R.*, 1247-58, p. 61.

³ *R.G.* i. 377, 417 illustrate this. Bonacius was from Aug. to Sept. 1254 "locum tenens" for Roger the Tailor; *ib.* pp. 419-430, *passim*. Roger's clerk, Robert of Linton, also acted in Gascony at this time.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1247-58, pp. 449-450.

exchequer. As early as February 7, 1253, the king ordered Roger the Tailor, with the assistance of his associates, to account to the barons of the exchequer for his custody of the great wardrobe,¹ and Roger was "bound to the king in accounts, reckonings and debts" till the day of his death, more than four years later.² Inevitably, direct responsibility to the exchequer tended to make the great wardrobe drift away from the wardrobe, especially as the keepers of the great wardrobe also derived their salaries,³ and their supplies of money, from the exchequer. Nevertheless, the arrangements made for Roger's account seem exceptional. As head of a sub-department, the natural accountability of the great wardrobe keeper was to his direct chief, the keeper of the wardrobe, and it was not until seventy years later that exchequer accountability was adopted as a permanency. Even then there was another reaction between 1351 and 1360.

A sixth and last reason for the separation was the increasing magnitude of great wardrobe transactions. Details of these will be given when we treat of great wardrobe finance, and it is enough to say here, that by the time of the Barons' Wars great wardrobe expenditure seems to have averaged the comparatively large sum of two thousand pounds a year.⁴

For these six reasons alone we are justified in saying that, on the eve of the Barons' Wars, the great wardrobe had attained a status of its own in the royal household. The keepership had become an office of sufficient significance to receive some attention from the baronial reformers, although, except for personal changes, the course of its development was little interrupted. The office of *emptor et provisor regis* had already crystallised into a definite shape, but for the next generation two persons were customarily appointed to discharge its functions. Following

¹ *C.R.* 66/18d, 37 Hen. III.: "Rex providit, quod Rogerus Scissor reddat compotum suum ad scaccarium regis, de tempore quo habuit custodiam magne garderobe regis, una cum Johanne de Summercote et Ricardo de Shereburn, sociis suis ad hoc assignatis, et quod incipiat reddere compotum illud ad idem scaccarium, primo die lune quadragesime proximo futuro. Et mandatum est predicto Rogero quod ad diem illum sic ad predictum scaccarium ad predictum compotum coram baronibus eiusdem scaccarii reddendum; quibus rex mandavit quod compotum illud audire incipiant. Et mandatum est predictis sociis suis quod sint ibi, parati ad respondendum secum de custodia predicta de tempore quo ad hoc fuerint socii sui."

² *C.P.R.*, 1247-58, p. 629.

³ See, for example, *Lib. R.* 32/19 for 1255, and *ib.* 35/8 for 1258.

⁴ See later, pp. 417-418.

earlier precedents, one of the joint buyers was usually a clerk, and the other a townsman of business experience. Thus, on August 27, 1257, the king appointed Richard of Ewell as *captor garderobe regis* in succession to Roger the Tailor, recently deceased, and directed him to associate himself with Hugh of the Tower, Roger's old comrade, as buyer. We have seen how they began their work by a personal view of the state of the wardrobe of the Tower.¹ Their commission was completed on November 4, when they were also appointed "to make prises and purchases for the wardrobe in all fairs and markets."² When Ewell was made temporary custodian of crossbows of horn and barrels of bolts, the great wardrobe was recognised as a store for arms as well as for cloth.³ Richard of Ewell, a London citizen, who had served as sheriff of London and Middlesex from Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1257,⁴ like Hugh of the Tower, had had earlier experience of making royal prises, for in 1253, the ordinary buyers being in Gascony with the king, the regents, queen Eleanor and Richard of Cornwall, appointed him, on August 17 of that year, "to take, for the queen's use, cloth, furs, wax and other things for the wardrobe."⁵

One illustration of how little the instruction to reform the king's household, contained in the Provisions of Oxford, was regarded, is that Richard of Ewell and Hugh of the Tower continued to serve as buyers until the battle of Lewes. During these disturbed years their daily work was beset with all kinds of difficulties. It was almost impossible to find the money to pay for the cloth which they seized at the great fairs. So late as 1263, Roger the Tailor's debts were still unpaid,⁶ and in 1268 the large adverse balance of Ewell and Hugh's account for 1257-

¹ *C.R.* 72, 41 Hen. III.; see above, n. 4, p. 361.

² *C.P.R.*, 1247-58, p. 604.

³ *Ib.*, 1258-66, p. 300. There were at this period two keepers of the king's arms, Peter of Champvent and Roger the Convert; *ib.* pp. 266, 310, and Ewell soon handed over his crossbows and bolts to Roger to keep them. The Tower seems to have been the ordinary place of custody; see the next chapter for the growth of the wardrobe of arms in the Tower and its close association with the great wardrobe. The Tower was already an armoury in 1236; *C.R.*, 1234-37, p. 265.

⁴ *Lib. de Ant. Leg.*, pp. 24, 224. He lived near the Franciscan convent, opposite the church of St. Nicholas of the Shambles; *C.P.R.*, 1266-72, p. 29.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1247-58, p. 221; cf. *ib.*, 1258-66, p. 134.

⁶ *Ib.*, 1258-66, p. 262.

1258 was still owing to the merchants who had supplied the goods.¹

The king was more willing to acknowledge his indebtedness than to provide means for discharging it.² At one time the obligations of the buyers were to be discharged from the temporalities of the bishopric of Winchester, then in the king's hands.³ At another, urgent directions were given to the exchequer to make these debts a first charge upon the money coming into it.⁴ In 1262-63 the king was compelled to pledge his jewels to purchase cloth,⁵ and in October 1263 there was a pathetic mandate to Richard of Ewell to send the king cloth of gold and arras sufficient to enable Henry to make his customary oblations, and to take this charge upon himself boldly, until the exchequer of the next January.⁶ Not until 1260 did Richard himself get "worthy remuneration" for his long service, in the form of a grant of £10 a year out of the first available escheat.⁷ In September 1263, so great a personage as the king's steward, Roger of Leyburn, had to go to Winchester fair to appease the foreign merchants and assist in the purchases for the wardrobe.⁸

A month after the battle of Lewes, Richard of Ewell had ceased to act as buyer. On June 28, 1264, Hugh of the Tower was associated with Robert of Linton and Emery Bucke to make purchases for the wardrobe at Boston fair.⁹ By November 4, Hugh and Robert of Linton were acting alone.¹⁰ This Robert of Linton was almost certainly not Roger the Tailor's former clerk, of whom we have already spoken,¹¹ but much more probably the Londoner who had been sheriff of the city from Michaelmas 1254 to February 15, 1255, when he was displaced by the citizens to

¹ *C.R.* 84/7.

² *C.P.R.*, 1258-66, p. 69. Acknowledgments of royal debts to merchants of Douai and Ypres.

³ *Ib.* p. 94. Mandate to the guardian to pay, out of the proceeds of the Winchester fair and the rent of the bishopric, sums amounting to 2200 marks, and, if these did not suffice, to sell the crops of the bishopric that the king might have the money for the merchants by a fixed day; cf. *ib.* p. 174.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 155. This was a charge of £650 for goods bought at St. Ives fair.

⁵ *Ib.* pp. 213, 218, for cloth bought at St. Ives from merchants of Douai, Ypres and Lucca (1262). *Ib.* p. 257, a list of jewels, pledged by Henry at Ghent for 1000 marks, to pay Lucca merchants for cloth bought at the same fair. For the state of the exchequer at this period see above, i. 296-297.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 292.

⁷ *Ib.* p. 134.

⁸ *Ib.* p. 276.

⁹ *Ib.* p. 329.

¹⁰ *Ib.* p. 385.

¹¹ See above, p. 357.

please the king.¹ This identification is the more reasonable since Linton became buyer only after the collapse of the royal power, and lost office with Ralph of Sandwich, the Montfortian keeper of the wardrobe, on August 6, immediately after the battle of Evesham.² Linton was, moreover, reinstated as sheriff, or bailiff, in 1267, by the *minutus populus civitatis* during the brief revival of the popular cause under the earl of Gloucester.³ We are therefore justified in making the sheriff and the buyer one person.

Hugh of the Tower, a royal clerk whose memory went back to the worst periods of Henry's reign, was sufficiently aloof from politics to remain at his post all through the vicissitudes of the barons' wars. When Linton was removed, Richard of Ewell returned as Hugh's associate. He was already back in office by November 28, 1265,⁴ and on August 6, 1266, was pardoned debts on the arrears of his account which he "cannot account for at the exchequer, because the king's writs which he received thereof and his rolls, were plundered in his houses in London" during the recent disturbances.⁵ The renewed partnership of Richard and Hugh was not broken till 1268, when Hugh ceased to act.⁶ From that date until at least the end of 1270, Richard of Ewell, who received in April 1268 a grant of sustenance of £40 a year for his long service,⁷ continued as *emptor et provisor*. In 1266 they were associated with a Roger of Lintyn who was clearly a different person from the Lintons already mentioned.⁸ After 1268, Ewell's colleague was John of Sutton.⁹ Sutton was a

¹ *Lib. de Ant. Leg.*, pp. 20-22, 224.

² Linton and Hugh did not accompany Henry III. on his compulsory expedition to Hereford which led up to Evesham; *E.A.* 350/4.

³ *Lib. de Ant. Leg.*, p. 91. Moreover, in *C.P.R.*, 1258-66, pp. 467-468, there is a grant on Oct. 19, 1265, to Hugh Fitzotho of the houses in Wood Street, London, lately the property of Robert of Linton, "the king's enemy." This was the Hugh Fitzotho who became steward of Edward I.'s household. See above, ii. 25.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1258-66, p. 515.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 624.

⁶ *Pipe*, 115/1.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1266-72, p. 219.

⁸ *C.R.* 83/1: "Mandatum est Ricardo de Ewell et Hugoni de Turry, emptoribus garderobe regis, quod faciant habere Rogero de Lintyn, socio suo, et tribus armigeris suis, robas de termino Pentecostes proximo preterito" (Sept. 13, 1266). Is he the Roger de Lintyn of *C.P.R.*, 1258-66, p. 28, who brought to England an Ethiopian slave named Bartholomew, who, though apparently a convert to Christianity, ran away from his lord? The patent is a mandate to all persons to arrest the fugitive.

⁹ *Archaeologia*, xxxiii. 271, from *Lib. R.* 45/6, 53 Hen. III.; *C.P.R.*, 1266-72, pp. 221, 229, 263, 297, 300.

king's clerk, who, as Aubrey de Fécamp's personal clerk, was already acquainted with wardrobe routine.¹ He received, in April 1268, the accustomed grant of £20 a year during his period of office as buyer.² His appointment may be assumed to have been made not long before this date. He seems to have remained in office until his death, which occurred either late in 1270 or early in 1271.³ In April 1271, Ewell was still buyer of the wardrobe, but his associate then was William of Arundel,⁴ no doubt also a king's clerk. On July 13 William of Arundel, buyer of the wardrobe, received the grant of £20 per annum which Sutton had had in his lifetime.⁵ The pair remained in office for the rest of the reign of Henry III., and Ewell was still alive in 1280.⁶

We have now examined the genesis of the keepership of the great wardrobe. In title, function, and emolument,⁷ the "buyers," "takers" and "providers" anticipated the "keepers" of a later date. They were, however, infrequently described as keepers, even in popular language. Their office was normally a dual one, a clerk and a merchant being constantly associated as joint holders. They were not appointed by letters patent. Their salary from the exchequer was, however, assigned by patent, and they generally received "writs of aid," drafted as patents, which invested their position with something of the public character that appointment by patent conferred.⁸

The dual buyership persisted into the reign of Edward I., who went back to his father's policy of associating the king's tailor with a royal clerk. The great wardrobe purchases, necessary for

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1258-66, p. 68. This was in 1260.

² *Ib.*, 1266-72, p. 221; compare *ib.* p. 263.

³ *Ib.* p. 551 shows him already dead on July 13, 1271.

⁴ *C.R.* 88/7, Apr. 4, 1271.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1266-72, p. 551.

⁶ *Ib.*, 1272-81, p. 402.

⁷ *Ib.*, 1247-58, p. 484, grant on June 25, 1256, to Hugh of the Tower, king's clerk, of 30 marks a year at the exchequer so long as he shall be in the king's service; *ib.* p. 606, grant on Aug. 16, 1257, to Richard of Ewell, citizen of London, appointed to make prizes and purchases for the wardrobe at fairs, of £20 a year at the exchequer for his maintenance in the king's service. In both cases the grant preceded in date the patent of appointment as "emtor." Grants for maintenance were not the same as wages of a definite office. But compare *Lib. R.* 35/8, 43 Hen. III., which shows that these sums were the official wages of Hugh and Richard.

⁸ Sometimes the mandates in the form of writs close approach nearly to appointments, but they are statements of the fact of appointment, not the appointment itself. These writs, both patent and close, distinguish the buyers from ordinary household servants.

Edward's coronation ceremony on August 19, 1274, were made by the buyers, Giles of Oudenarde, the king's clerk, and Adenettus, the king's tailor.¹ Giles of Oudenarde had been controller of the wardrobe of Henry III. from 1268 to the old king's death, but his appointment as *emptor* cannot be regarded as degradation to a lower post. When Edward came back from the Holy Land, he had his wardrobe staff already with him, and Giles was compensated for his inevitable displacement by this and other offices.² His title was normally *emptor magne garderobe*, though on occasion he and his colleague were described as *emptores garderobe ad empciones magne garderobe inde faciendas*.³

The two remained in office together until sometime before June 21, 1282, before which date the king's clerk, Hamo de la Legh, had been "deputed to the custody of the great wardrobe, and to make purchases for the king during pleasure,"⁴ in place of Giles. Giles kept his other posts much longer, but gave up the great wardrobe for good.⁵ Adenettus accounted jointly

¹ *Pipe*, 124/24d. Adenettus is sometimes called Admettus, sometimes Adinettus, and occasionally Adam, or Adam the king's tailor; *C.C.R.*, 1278-88, pp. 4, 364, and once "Adam le Tayllur de Bidek"; *ib.*, 1288-96, p. 136. His full name was Adam or Adenettus de Bidik; *C.P.R.*, 1272-81, p. 188; *ib.*, 1292-1301, p. 185. The last passage makes it certain that Adenettus the tailor and Adenettus de Bidik were the same person, and *C.P.R.*, 1281-92, p. 198, proves the identity of Adam and Adenettus. He was "king's yeoman," and therefore a household official; *ib.* p. 198. Can Bidik be Bidache, Basses Pyrénées? Anyhow, the index of *C.C.R.*, 1288-96, p. 537, "Bidik C°. Berks?" is a bad guess. "Adenettus cissor" held, in 1282, lands in Ewloe in what is now Flintshire, and complained of being robbed by Welshmen on Palm Sunday, 1282. A Welsh jury acquitted the accused, and the justice of Chester amerced Adenettus for his false complaint; *Flint Pleas*, 1283-85, pp. 36-37, ed. J. G. Edwards (Flintshire Hist. Soc., viii., 1922). I am pretty sure that this was the king's tailor, though he might possibly have been a Welsh tailor with a similar name, such as Ednyfed. Adenettus' accounts for 4-8 Edw. I. are in *Chanc. Misc.* 3/11. In *ib.* 3/14 there is a special roll of his purchases at Paris in 6 Edw. I. The sum was £1429:5:1, "livres parisais," worth in "livres tournois" £1786:11:4.

² See also for him i. 315-316. Giles was also keeper of the works at the palace of Westminster and the Tower of London, constable of the Tower and keeper of the wardrobes of Alfonso and Edward, the king's sons. He was sometimes called Giles de Garderoba; *C.C.R.*, 1279-88, pp. 12, 14, etc.

³ *Pipe*, 119/22, 3 Edw. I., and *ib.* 123/22d, 7 Edw. I.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1281-92, p. 27. This writ of June 21, 1282, is not a patent of appointment but a writ of aid, issued to secure recognition for his authority. He must have been appointed earlier. His successor, Roger de Lisle, who accounted from 1287, received his writ of aid in 1289. See later, p. 373.

⁵ Giles was still levying prises for the support of the king's children in 1287; *R.G.* ii. 471. He died before July 2, 1305, *Exch. Misc.* 5/6. Compare *C.P.R.*, 1301-7, pp. 367 and 372.

with Hamo for the expenses of the great wardrobe, just as previously he had accounted along with Giles. He seems, however, to have been slightly inferior to his clerical colleagues, for his accounts were "read through and examined" by Giles.¹

While Giles and Adenettus were in office, the Household Ordinance of 1279 brought about considerable change in the constitution of the great wardrobe. Neither Giles nor Adenettus is mentioned by name in this text, but their office received a good deal of attention, and the resultant alterations suggest that they were, perhaps, not regarded as true members of the wardrobe staff. Colour is lent to this theory by two other facts. The first is that the assignment of salary to the *emptor* was made by patent, though he himself, like the chief household officers, was originally appointed by royal word of mouth; and the second is that the *emptor* was not necessarily a clerk, although all non-military officers of the wardrobe were chosen from the clergy. These individualistic, somewhat revolutionary, peculiarities of the great wardrobe were evidently looked upon with dislike, if not with actual alarm. At all events, the new ordinance restored the buyership to a position of proper subordination to the wardrobe.

The ordinance of 1279 definitely prescribed that the treasurer, or keeper, of the wardrobe should, in conjunction with one of the stewards and another member of the king's council, be made responsible for the annual accounts of the great wardrobe. These were, apparently, to be tendered to the exchequer as part of the keeper's own account.² The treasurer was also ordered to appoint "a certain man to buy at three fairs a year all the things which appertain to the great wardrobe. And let this man be keeper of the great wardrobe. And let him go to the

¹ For example, *Chanc. Misc.* 3/11: "minute particule" of the accounts of Adenettus, 3-8 Edw. I. These were "perlecte et examinate per Egidium." Adenettus had a clerk of his own whose wages were 4½d. a day. By Feb. 1296 "Adam de Bidyk, king's tailor," was superseded by Pierrot le Ireys, king's yeoman, in the custody of the assize of cloths, both on this side and beyond the sea, because he had "grown too feeble to execute the office"; *C.P.R.*, 1292-1301, p. 185, but he remained in some post, apparently that of king's tailor, till 1299, though constantly appointing attorneys "by reason of his weakness"; *ib.* pp. 345, 414. The last date of appointment of attorneys is May 17, 1299.

² See for this text above, ii. 161.

fairs to make these purchases, and let him be sworn to the king with special reference to this business. And let the usher of the wardrobe be his controller, and let him view the purchases and the liveries and testify at the account." The treasurer could, if necessary, appoint someone to act instead of the usher. The keeper of the great wardrobe was not to buy or deliver anything without the special command of the treasurer, and that in the presence of the controller, who was to accompany him to the fairs where purchases were made. If he ventured to act alone, his expenditure was not to be allowed.

The effect of these elaborate provisions was to give the great wardrobe a complete staff, a definite sphere and a responsible head. That head was, however, to be appointed by the keeper of the wardrobe, and was only to act with the latter's authorisation, so that he would have become less independent than the "buyers" of Henry III.'s later years. As a matter of fact, appointment by the keeper never became operative. Yet with the recognition of the keepership as a definite wardrobe office, it followed that its holders would necessarily be clerks. When Adenettus' vested interest disappeared,¹ no more lay heads of the great wardrobe were appointed, and one clerk was henceforth its monarch. Gradually, the title of buyer gave way to the more impressive designation of keeper, or clerk.

No immediate change in the staff was made. Giles of Oudenarde evidently became the first keeper of the great wardrobe under the new provisions, and we know that Hamo de la Legh succeeded him after June 1282. There is no trace of any re-appointment, so that we do not know whether or not the treasurer took advantage of the ordinance to renominate Giles to the post which he already held. The treasurer did, however, avail himself of the provision that he could appoint someone other than the usher to act as controller. I have found no evidence of the then usher, John Read, going to fairs to make purchases, and it is pretty clear that Adenettus continued to act, though apparently as Read's substitute, not in his own right. Thus the position of Adenettus became obviously subordinate, and his modest wage never rose above 7½d. a day.

In the exchequer enrolments Hamo and Adenettus continued

¹ He was still alive in 1299. See above, n. 1, p. 370.

to be jointly responsible for the accounts till November 20, 1286,¹ but the exchequer regarded Hamo alone as responsible for those of the succeeding year.² Such responsibility was, of course, to the wardrobe, whose keeper was answerable to the exchequer. Hamo went abroad with Edward I. in May 1286.³ He died on the continent on, or before, August 10, 1287, so that his executors had to act for him.⁴ They sent in the account for this broken period of nearly two years, between November 20, 1285, and August 10, 1287.⁵ As the first complete original great wardrobe account which has survived, it is of considerable interest. It was drawn up in the name of Hamo alone, but its contents show that Adenettus also delivered into the wardrobe a roll of particulars of his own.⁶

From August 10, 1287, a new clerk of the great wardrobe, Roger de Lisle, who had previously been one of Hamo's juniors,⁷ began to account. The system, authorised in 1279, then took full effect. Adenettus remained at the great wardrobe as king's tailor, and continued to make purchases jointly with Lisle,⁸ but from August 10, 1287, to November 20, 1290, he was described as Lisle's controller, and Lisle rendered his accounts by the testimony of Adenettus.⁹ Since Adenettus was not the usher of the

¹ *Pipe*, 136/31 (19 Edw. I.); *E.A.* 352/2, "unde idem Hamo et Adam sunt reddituri compotum in garderoba."

² *Pipe*, 136/31, 31d.

³ He received protection for a year on Apr. 26, 1286; *C.P.R.*, 1281-92, p. 239. The protection was renewed on Dec. 4, 1286, until a fortnight after Easter, 1287 (*ib.* p. 261), and again on Apr. 15, 1287, until June 1 (*ib.* p. 266).

⁴ *Pipe*, 136/31d; *ib.* 138/26.

⁵ *E.A.* 352/3: "Compotus Hamonis de Legh, clerici, emptoris et liberatoris magne garderobe, a festo S. Edmundi, anno xiv°, usque ad festum S. Laurencii, anno xv°." For the first of these years there is also in *ib.* 352/1 a "contrarotulus de diuersis liberacionibus," which includes the great wardrobe "liberaciones," with others for wines, the household of the king's sons, etc. *ib.* 352/2 seems a duplicate of this.

⁶ *ib.* 352/3: "et empicionibus diuersis et necessariis factis per Adinettum, cissorem regis . . . ut patet in rotulo de particulis quem idem Adenettus liberauit in garderoba, cxxxij. li xis viid." These particulars are probably similar to the roll of Adenettus for 3-8 Edw. I. in *Chanc. Misc.* 3/11.

⁷ *M.B.E.*, *T. of R.*, 201/95. He was first admitted to the king's wages in the household on Aug. 31, 1283 (*Chanc. Misc.* 4/2 m. 9), and was acting as a wardrobe clerk in 1285; *ib.* 4/3 f. 7d.

⁸ *E.A.* 352/22: "In pannis, pelluris, etc., emptis per R. de Insula, clericum, emptorem magne garderobe, et Adinettum, cissorem regis." He was often absent from court. Thus, in the two years between Jan. 1, 1288, and Dec. 31, 1289, he was not paid for the 456 days "quos vacauit"; *Chanc. Misc.* 4/4, f. 12d.

⁹ See above, p. 371. *E.A.* 352/10: "compotus Rogeri de Insula . . . per testimonium Adinetti, contrarotulatoris sui." In the account for 1287-88 this

wardrobe, we may regard his position under Lisle as the recognition of an old servant's claim.

In one respect the ordinance of 1279 was modified. Although the keeper of the wardrobe was directed to appoint the clerk of the great wardrobe, he never obtained the formal patronage to this office. The chief reason was that while the ordinance was still young, long before there was any thought of separating the great wardrobe from the household, motives of practical convenience led to the appointment of the clerk of the great wardrobe by letters patent. The clerk of the great wardrobe had to traverse the land and buy or seize the commodities required for his office. The owners of the goods he required were generally unwilling to part with them on the terms offered to them. Some constraining authority, which no man could resist, was therefore desirable. At first the hand of the "buyer" was strengthened by his being given a "writ of aid" under the great seal, addressed to all the king's bailiffs and liegemen, requesting them to help him in his work. Thus, Hamo de la Legh, previously "deputed to the custody" of the great wardrobe, date not specified, received on June 21, 1282, a letter patent of aid.¹ A similar writ of aid was issued in 1289 in favour of Roger de Lisle, but only after he had already accounted for his office for two years.² To pass from a writ of aid to an already appointed officer, to a writ conferring his appointment, required little imagination, and the step was taken on September 28, 1295, when John Husthwaite was appointed by patent to the custody, during pleasure, of the office of the great wardrobe.³

Not only were Husthwaite's successors thus appointed, but when a new king wished to continue the keeper in office, a patent

reference to Adenettus as controller is struck out, though it is retained for the years 1288-90. In *Pipe*, 136, on the dorse of the membrane containing the wardrobe accounts (the membranes are not numbered), we are told, in reference to the account of Nov. 20, 1290, to Nov. 20, 1291, "de quibus Rogerus reddidit compotum in magna garderoba." Is this a slip or an authorised change? In *Pipe*, 123/7, 22d (7 E. I.) it is said of the accounts of 6 Edw. I., "de quibus Egidius et Admettus debent compotum reddere in garderoba." I see no reason for believing that this system was ever changed until the re-introduction, a generation later, of direct accountability to the exchequer.

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1281-92, p. 27. Cf. above, p. 371.

² *R.G.* ii. 323. This was issued on June 10, 1289, at Condat, near Libourne, not long before Edward I.'s return to England.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1292-1301, p. 149.

of reappointment was issued.¹ Even the craftsmen working under the keeper gradually came to be appointed in this fashion. Such appointment by patent, though originating from purely utilitarian motives, had the effect of isolating the keeper of the great wardrobe from the ordinary household clerk, nominated *oretenus*. The uniqueness of his position was emphasised by the establishment of his office away from court, in the city of London. Yet for the whole of the fourteenth century his post was still considered a household one, and as late as 1371, keeper Sleaford's wages were described as those "accustomed to be paid according to the statute of the household."²

A further complication arose under Edward III. when the path of history is darkened by the confused way in which some of the patents of appointment to the great wardrobe were enrolled on the fine roll, while others were still placed on the patent roll. The first instance of enrolment on the fine roll was Ousefleet's reappointment at the very beginning of the reign. It afforded a precedent for the enrolment on the fine roll of the appointments of Zouch (1329), Norwell (1335) and Charnels (1337),³ but those of Beche (1334), Cross (1337), Retford (1349), and Buckingham (1350) were enrolled on the patent roll. Enrolment on the fine roll prevailed for Wingerworth (1353), Dalton (1353), Newbury (1358), and Snaith (1361). The appointment of John Sleaford (1371) was enrolled on the patent roll, as were the appointments of two of the three keepers of the great wardrobe under Richard II.⁴ This tedious statement is worth making, if only to warn historians that patents are by no means always enrolled in the patent roll. It is not enough to say that it became customary to register certain classes of patents among the fines, for often the selection seems purely capricious; a device of the chancery clerks to increase the trouble of historians! Unfortunately, chancery enrolments were made to help the office, not for the

¹ Thus Stokes was reappointed by Edward II. in 1307, and Ousefleet by Edward III. in 1327; *C.P.R.*, 1307-13, p. 1; *C.F.R.* iv. 15. The exceptional case of John Sleaford is due to the fact that, though acting under Richard II., he was regarded as technically the keeper of Edward III.'s wardrobe; *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 146.

² *Ib.*, 1370-74, p. 155.

³ The references are: *C.F.R.* iv. 15, 118, 439; v. 386; vi. 351, 366; vii. 85, 162.

⁴ Alan Stokes' appointment is on the fine roll; *C.F.R.* ix. 11.

benefit of historians, and the officials knew more about the methods of enrolment than we moderns can hope to learn.

Long after the clerical keeper of the great wardrobe had been established, he was often designated by vaguer titles than those assigned to him in the ordinance of 1279. He was still called *emptor et provisor*, or simply by one or other of these two names. He was often described as *clericus magne garderobe* and occasionally as *liberator*, or by such a combination as *clericus et emptor*, *emptor et liberator*,¹ or *clericus, emptor et liberator*.² Sometimes he was called simply *clericus garderobe*.³ It was not until late in the reign of Edward III. that the title *custos magne garderobe* became his usual description. Even after this he was called *clericus et provisor*⁴ and *custos et provisor*.⁵ The full official title is perhaps best given in the description of the keeper normally affixed to the enrolments of the accounts of the later fourteenth century. This is *custos magne garderobe ad empciones pannorum, cere, specierie, et aliarum rerum ad dictam garderobam spectancium specialiter deputatus*.⁶

Up to the end of Edward I.'s reign, the keepers of the great wardrobe were not men of great mark, though the last keeper of the period, Ralph Stokes, John Husthwaite's successor, was a man of considerable departmental importance and of prodigious activity. He was in office between April 15, 1300, and September 11, 1320, when he was succeeded by William Cusance.⁷ Cusance, unpopular as a foreigner, and as the personal clerk of Hugh Despenser the younger, shared the fate of his former master, being, after a few months of office, replaced on December 20, 1321, by Gilbert Wigton,⁸ a former controller of the wardrobe, who owed his relegation to this post to the hostility of the Despensers.⁹ Ultimately Wigton was driven from court altogether, when

¹ *L.Q.G.* p. 354.

² *E.A.* 352/10,3.

³ *I.R.* 249/21. Aug. 1, 1330, "Thome de Useflete, nuper clerico garderobe domini regis."

⁴ *E.A.* 385/1; *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/3-24.

⁵ *Ib.* m. 27.

⁶ *Ib.* 4/23. This is from Sleaford's account of 1371-72.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1292-1301, p. 510; *ib.*, 1307-13, p. 1; *ib.*, 1317-21, p. 504. Stokes received monies in 1300, for the wages and expenses of his clerks, "pro vadiis et expensis clericorum morancium Londoniis et tenencium locum dicti domini Radulphi ibidem et alibi ad mandata regis recipienda et exsequenda"; *L.Q.G.* p. 355. For Cusance, see *Pl. Edw. II.* pp. 136, and above, ii. 272.

⁸ *C.P.R.*, 1321-24, p. 41.

⁹ *Rot. Parl.* ii. 436.

Thomas Ousefleet took his place on August 26, 1323.¹ Ousefleet survived the troubles of the end of Edward II.'s time, and remained in office for the first years of Edward III.²

It was during Ousefleet's keepership that the household and exchequer reforms between 1318 and 1324 radically altered the position of the great wardrobe and its officers, and defined more precisely the nature of the duties and activities of the latter. To begin with, the York ordinance of 1318³ recited that "great damage and loss" had arisen "from the wasting and ill-spending of things that came for the household by delivery of the clerk of the great wardrobe" for "want of setting down the certainty of the price every day upon the account of the household, before the steward and treasurer as in other offices." To remedy this, the keeper of the great wardrobe, still described as its clerk-purveyor, was required to deliver to the household, by indenture, all commodities in his keeping, specifying their particulars and prices. In that way, practical demonstration of his subordination to the steward and treasurer was made.

On the other hand, the ordinance gave the clerk-purveyor a permanent status in the wardrobe hierarchy. Rank was assigned to him immediately after the keeper of the privy seal, and somewhat smaller allowances than that officer enjoyed were granted to him from the hall, where his esquire took his meals. Like the other chief officers, he was now to have his chamber and chamberlain, and he was also obliged to "lie in the wardrobe" when he was at court. Although he was to "remain in court as much as his office will permit him, unless he have special license of the king,"⁴ the tacitly admitted limitation implies that, in practice, force of circumstances unavoidably withdrew him from the royal presence at times. Accordingly, the effect of the recommendations perpetuating great wardrobe subordination to the wardrobe was neutralised by other regulations.

The position of the keeper of the great wardrobe, unlike that

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1321-24, p. 337.

² He was acting on Aug. 6, 1328, but "late keeper" on Jan. 26, 1329; *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, pp. 305 and 437. His successor was appointed on Jan. 26, 1329; *Enr. Acts. (W. and H.)* 3/13.

³ *Pl. of Edw. II.* pp. 274-276, gives the chief relevant passages.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 275: "Et qi la dit clerc purueour demurge en court tant auant come soun office lem pourra suffrere, sil ne soit par especial counge du roi."

of the keeper of the privy seal, did not go on improving, although the association of the great wardrobe with the household also became steadily less and less, until before the end of our period the department and its keeper were outside the household for nearly all purposes. The "yearly fee" of the keeper, when he was out of court, was defined in the ordinance as £20 a year until he received benefices worth 100 marks a year, after which he was to finance himself.¹ But this fee of £20 a year was soon paid to him in all circumstances, just as it seems to have been paid to some of his predecessors, and came to be regarded first as his *certum feodum*, then, before long, as his *antiquum feodum*. Both earlier and later, however, the normal salary was supplemented. Hamo de la Legh and Roger de Lisle both received £40 a year,² and Ousefleet not only received thirteen pence a day while he was accounting, but continued to take that sum daily for the whole of the next year. This was, substantially, the wage of 1318, but a considerable increase in salary soon attached to the post, because a habit was formed, under Edward III., of adding to the "ancient fee" a *rewardum* of £80.³ The rise in prices and salaries, following on the heels of warfare, was partly responsible for this in the first place, and the constant recurrence of war kept up the level of values for the rest of our period.⁴

An additional precaution against confusion in the accounting of the great wardrobe was taken, by making the chief usher of the wardrobe, also called clerk of the spicery, the channel through whom wax, spices, linen and other great wardrobe commodities were to be delivered, by "good indenture," for the use of the household, the keeper of the great wardrobe being instructed to mention

¹ *Ib.* p. 274: "tanque il eit par le roi c. marcz de rent."

² *Pipe*, 138/26. The £20 fee goes back, however, to the days of Hugh of the Tower and Richard of Ewell. See above, p. 368 n. 7. It was also the fixed sum for fee and wages allowed to Ralph Stokes in 28 Edw. I. (*L.Q.G.* p. 355), "percipienti per annum lib. xx de certo, nomine vadium et expensarum suarum pro huiusmodi certo, de toto anno presenti."

³ *Ib.* 393/11. The practice is well brought out in *Enr. Acct. (W. and H.)* No. 4, m. 12: "Et eidem Johanni de Newbury custodi pro certo feodo suo . . . scilicet juxta ratam xx li. per annum . . . et prout huiusmodi feodum allocatum fuit diversis nuper custodibus predictae garderobe. Et eidem Johanni pro rewardo suo ultra feodum predictum juxta ratam iii^{xx} li. pro huiusmodi rewardo per annum." This was in 1360. Alan Stokes, under Ric. II., had a grant of wages, "iuxta formam statuti hospicii consuetam"; *ib.* 5/1. This included the reward and fee mentioned in the text; *ib.* m. 4; *E.A.* 400/12.

⁴ For instance in Sleaford's account for 1371-72; *E.A.* 397/3.

"the price and weight of each commodity." The clerk of the spicery was charged to attend at the daily household account, like the clerks of the other offices, and to present to the steward and treasurer the particulars and the prices of everything within his purview, delivered and expended in his office for that day. This was no real innovation, for the ordinance of 1279 had already laid down that the usher of the wardrobe was to be the controller of the great wardrobe, and that he was to accompany its keeper to fairs to view his purchases and to account for them.¹ We have seen reason for believing that this provision had been neglected, or only occasionally executed, and it may well be that the safeguards enacted in 1318 first made this "control" effective. A permanent assistant, in the person of a second clerk of the spicery, was now given to the usher, to relieve him of the mechanical work of describing, weighing and pricing, which was, however, to be done under his direction. Both these functionaries belonged to the wardrobe, not to the great wardrobe, and their mission was to keep the great wardrobe in touch with the parent establishment, a mission they did not always succeed in fulfilling.

In compensation for these fetters, the keeper of the great wardrobe was given absolute control over the subordinates of his own department. Just as he was "charged" by the clerk of the spicery, so he in his turn was to "charge" the king's tailor, the pavilioner and the confectioner of spices, for all things issuing from their offices, mentioning quantities and prices. The indentures testifying to these transactions were to be shown four times a year to the treasurer of the wardrobe, so that he could certify the condition of the office of the great wardrobe.² These provisions were modified later by the second household ordinance of York of June 1323, which recommended that the clerk-purveyor of the great wardrobe should make a first "view of his office" on St. Andrew's Day, then a second view on Trinity Sunday, and his final account at Michaelmas, every year.³

The exchequer ordinance of May 1324 completed the re-organisation of the great wardrobe. Earlier reforms, it had declared, had neither accelerated wardrobe accounting, nor

¹ Above, i. 161; cf. *ib.* i. 214. The experience of the clerk of the spicery made it natural, when making promotions, to confer on him the keepership of the great wardrobe. See below, pp. 386-387.

² *Pl. of Edw. II.* p. 275.

³ *Ib.* p. 315.

relieved the keeper of the wardrobe from his obligation to render foreign accounts, "whereof he could have no knowledge nor discover their defects."¹ The remedy provided was the cutting adrift of the great wardrobe from the wardrobe, by the destruction of that dependence which had been insisted on in 1318. Henceforth, all monies for great wardrobe purveyances were to be furnished from the exchequer, under authority of royal warrants. Most important of all, the clerk of the great wardrobe was empowered to account directly to the exchequer for the future, leaving the keeper of the wardrobe answerable only for such goods as he might have received by indenture from the clerk of the great wardrobe for the use of the household.² "Foreign disbursements," although made by view of the keeper, were to be accounted for by the clerk alone. He was also to receive special consideration for purveyances beyond sea and far from the court, should it have been "necessary for the said clerk to make some disbursement in haste." Finally, the "great wardrober" was to make up his account by the morrow of Michaelmas for the year ending on July 7, the translation of St. Thomas, the martyr.³

These recommendations were at once acted upon, and Thomas Ousefleet, keeper of the great wardrobe since August 26, 1323, tendered his accounts to the exchequer yearly, from the date of his appointment to the end of the reign, and beyond.⁴ Thus the great wardrobe account was definitely separated from the wardrobe account, and joined the numerous "foreign accounts" audited by the exchequer in "another house," adjacent to that in which the sheriff's accounts received attention. There are continuous detailed enrolments for the rest of our period, except for two lamentable gaps: the one, between 1351 and 1360, due to a curious reversion to the older method whereby the great wardrobe accounted to the wardrobe instead of to

¹ *R.B.E.* p. 908. The date of this ordinance is May 6, 1324.

² *Ib.* p. 912: "Item nous voloms qe le dit clerk account a nostre eschequier."

³ *Ib.* p. 928. This was for Edward II.'s reign simply the regnal year. In above, ii. 266, I assumed that the "translation of St. Thomas" was July 3, the feast of the translation of St. Thomas the Apostle. I forgot that the St. Thomas who really mattered in England was St. Thomas the Martyr, that is St. Thomas of Canterbury. My text must be corrected accordingly.

⁴ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)*, 3/1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11; *E.A.* 383/2, 9.

the exchequer ;¹ the other, between 1387 and 1390, owing, presumably, to the chaotic conditions then prevailing.² Notwithstanding this deficiency, unmitigated by the survival of a single group of "particulars," the accounts we have are sufficiently copious for us to find out the complete constitution, duties, revenues and expenses of the great wardrobe.

The formative period was over by 1324, and for as long as we are concerned with the great wardrobe, we may regard the situation as unchanged. A certain amount of growth was still to take place, but it was all along familiar lines, and even the modification in accountability in 1351-60 had no serious effect upon the internal economy of the office. The important milestones in its subsequent fourteenth century history are its going "out of court" and its location in a home of its own in the city of London.

In these circumstances, a different method of treatment is desirable. We have grouped the early history of the great wardrobe round the fortunes of the various heads of the office. Now it will be easier to pursue each aspect of its activity separately to the end of our period. We must examine the staff of the department, the loosely attached craftsmen as well as the head of the office and his subordinates ; then we must consider its habitation and the twofold process of separation from the household and settlement in permanent quarters ; and lastly we must distinguish its various functions as collector and storer of goods, as manufacturer of articles more conveniently made than bought, as distributor of commodities, and as an accounting office.

Let us begin by taking up again the interrupted history of the keepership. The power gained by the great wardrobe in its emancipation from wardrobe control naturally enhanced the dignity of its keeper, though this was not immediately obvious. Thomas Ousefleet, the first keeper under the new system, was of the same somewhat mediocre type as the earlier keepers. Many of his successors were men like himself, who never rose above a respectable official level and had no prospects outside their office. Before long there were others alternating with them, to

¹ See later, p. 431. There are, of course, summary great wardrobe receipts and issues given in the wardrobe accounts.

² See later, pp. 423-424, cf. above, iii. 421-464.

whom the great wardrobe was only a stepping stone in a career of considerable distinction.

Of the thirteen keepers of the great wardrobe under Edward III., four, Edmund de la Beche,¹ William Norwell,² William Retford,³ and John Buckingham,⁴ were promoted to be keepers of the wardrobe of the household. Two of the four, Beche and Norwell, attained this post through the intermediate stage of the controllership, while the other two, Retford and Buckingham, went straight from the one keepership to the other. A fifth keeper of the great wardrobe, William de la Zouch, was promoted directly from the great wardrobe to the controllership, but never became keeper of the wardrobe of the household.⁵ Two of these five, Zouch and Buckingham, attained the highest preferment in state and church, Zouch becoming archbishop of York and Buckingham bishop of Lincoln. Both became keepers of the privy seal, now the third great office of state and not to be regarded any longer as a household office. Buckingham's career is additionally noteworthy because he was chamberlain of the exchequer before he went to the wardrobes, and returned to the exchequer as one of the barons when his keepership of the wardrobe terminated.⁶ He was almost the last of his type of keeper. It looks as if the renewed dependence of the great wardrobe on the ward-

¹ Keeper of the great wardrobe, July 15, 1334 (*C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 569), to Mar. 31, 1335; controller, Apr. 1, 1335, to Aug. 30, 1337; keeper of the wardrobe from Aug. 31, 1337, to July 11, 1338; *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)*, 2/14, 36, 37. See also above, pp. 81, 100-102.

² Keeper of the great wardrobe, Apr. 1, 1335, to Sept. 1, 1337 (*ib.* 3/28); controller from Aug. 31, 1337, to July 11, 1338; *ib.* 2/36; keeper of wardrobe from July 12, 1338, to May 27, 1340; *ib.* 15, 37, and 38. See also above, pp. 80, 102-106.

³ Keeper of the great wardrobe, Jan. 31, 1349, to Feb. 14, 1350; *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, pp. 257, 468; keeper of wardrobe from Feb. 14, 1350, to Feb. 23, 1353; *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)*, 4/1; keeper of wardrobe again from Feb. 26, 1357, to Dec. 15, 1358; *ib.* mm. 2 and 1d. See also above, pp. 114-116, 131-132.

⁴ Chamberlain of exchequer, 1347-50; keeper of the great wardrobe from Feb. 14, 1350 (*C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 468), to probably Feb. 23, 1353; later he became keeper of wardrobe from Feb. 23, 1353, to Feb. 26, 1357; *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)*, 4/1, 2; baron of exchequer, 1357-60; keeper of the privy seal of the regent Thomas of Woodstock, 1359-60; keeper of the king's privy seal, 1360-63; bishop of Lincoln, 1363-97; *d.* 1398. See also above, iii. 218; iv. 131, 133-135; and below, vol. v. chap. xvi.

⁵ Keeper of the great wardrobe, Jan. 26, 1329, to July 15, 1334 (*C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 437; *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 569); controller of wardrobe, July 31, 1334-Apr. 1, 1335 (*Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)*, 2/36); keeper of privy seal, 1335-37; treasurer of exchequer, Mar. 24, 1337; archbishop of York, 1342-52.

⁶ See previous n. 4.

robe, in 1351-60, reduced the status of the great wardrobe keeper, and that, even when this disadvantage was removed, the isolation of the great wardrobe in its home in the city, cut off from the household, seems to have made it less of a starting-point for an ambitious career. However that may be, it is clear that between 1353 and 1399 only one great wardrobe keeper achieved signal distinction. He was Richard Clifford, keeper of the great wardrobe between 1390 and 1398, who was promoted from that office to the privy seal, and afterwards held, consecutively, the bishoprics of Worcester and London.¹ In career he reminds us of Zouch and Buckingham, and, like Zouch, he was a man of high birth.

The keepers of the great wardrobe, less fortunate in their promotion, began with Ousefleet, of whom we have already spoken. The next in this category was Thomas Cross, who well represented the sound subordinate official type. His tenure of office, between 1337 and 1344, covered a period of exceptional activity for his department, but Cross seems to have been equal to the occasion. We shall later examine the active share he took in the administration of the king's army in the Netherlands, when the great wardrobe was established at Antwerp for the years 1338-40, its last visit to the continent. On the king's next passage in 1340, Cross stayed in England with his office, and was entrusted with the receivership of monies for the wages of soldiers chosen in Ireland to fight against the Scots.² In the church, Cross never obtained higher preferment than a few prebends and the deanery of St. Stephen's, Westminster.³ In the state, he became in 1347 chamberlain of the exchequer, but was dead by January 1349.⁴ His immediate successors, John Charnels (1344-45) and John Cook (1345-49), were equally valuable to their department, and had more interests apart from it than Cross. Charnels was con-

¹ Keeper of the great wardrobe, Nov. 28, 1390, to Feb. 2, 1398; *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)*, 4/5, 8d. He was allowed to hold the great wardrobe with the privy seal from Nov. 18, 1397, to Feb. 2, 1398; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 266. He was keeper of the privy seal, Nov. 18, 1397-1401; bishop of Worcester, 1401-7, and bishop of London, 1407-21. A favourite of Richard II., he was supple enough to receive promotion under Henry IV. He belonged to the great house of Clifford.

² *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 515, an order of July 6, 1340, to the exchequer to receive his account.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 146.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 254. He was made chamberlain on Mar. 18, 1347; *ib.*, 1345-48, p. 265.

spicuous, before his appointment to the great wardrobe, by reason of his service as receiver beyond seas for the king, and later as constable of Bordeaux, while Cook was afterwards made treasurer to queen Philippa.

After Buckingham's promotion in 1353 the calibre of the great wardrobe officers sensibly declined. His successor, the Derbyshire clerk, Robert Wingerworth, died a few months after his appointment.¹ The next keeper was that William Dalton, whom we know already as successively clerk, cofferer and controller of the wardrobe.² He was a veteran when he was appointed to the great wardrobe on June 25, 1353.³ His nomination to a post inferior to those which he had previously occupied suggests either limited ability or unpopularity. The only precedent was that of Gilbert Wigton in 1321, occasioned by political considerations.⁴ Unlike Wigton, Dalton remained a long time in office, and was busy, besides, as king's "inspector" or "justice" in the eastern counties, superintending prisages and inquiring into non-cocketted goods liable for customs.⁵ Mandates were still addressed to him on December 8, 1358,⁶ but his successor was appointed on January 2, 1359.⁷ The absence of the usual mandate to Dalton, or his executors, to surrender the records of his office to his successor, may be due to his having died so recently that his executors had not had time to take up his estate.

The lack of great wardrobe accounts for 1351-60 obscures the acts of the keepers of those years, but the accounts appear again with Dalton's successor, John Newbury, responsible from January 2, 1359, to June 29, 1361. Newbury had been, for a long time, treasurer of the wardrobe of queen Isabella, and was busy with settling her accounts even after his promotion to the great wardrobe.⁸ He died in office, and his executors' account

¹ In 1342-44 Wingerworth was acting as a subordinate to keeper Cross; *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 568, and *ib.*, 1343-45, pp. 112, 158. He was appointed on Jan. 15, 1353 (*C.F.R.* vi. 351); he was already dead on June 16 when he is described as "late keeper" (*ib.* p. 363).

² For his earlier history, see above, pp. 104, 110, 123, 130-131, n. 7.

³ *C.F.R.* vi. 366.

⁴ See above, p. 373.

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, pp. 438, 448, 454, 482.

⁶ *ib.* p. 482.

⁷ *C.F.R.* vii. 85.

⁸ He acted for Isabella until her death on Aug. 23, 1358; *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, pp. 469, 549. The commission to audit her accounts was only appointed on Jan. 20, 1359; *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 147. For the significance of his period at the great wardrobe, see later, pp. 431, 435-436.

for the last few months of his charge was the first to be presented to the exchequer after the former fashion. The two keepers who followed Newbury had both worked under him. In the account of Newbury's executors, Henry Snaith was credited with wages from the great wardrobe at the rate of 1s. a day, for the 140 days for which he was *extra curiam* during the period of Newbury's service. Snaith had been keeper of the "privy wardrobe of the household" in 1359, and, in 1360, keeper of the privy wardrobe of the Tower, an office he retained until 1365.¹ He stayed at the great wardrobe till 1371, when another great wardrobe clerk, John Sleaford, replaced him. Sleaford belonged to an administrative family, William Sleaford, presumably his brother, being clerk of the works at Westminster and the Tower from 1361 to 1377.² John himself had been keeper Newbury's personal clerk,³ and had kept the privy wardrobe since Snaith's resignation. There is clearly some policy behind this combination of the two wardrobes under the same head for so long a period.

John Sleaford continued as keeper for the first year of Richard II.'s reign, remained in residence in the city office, and was charged with the old king's burial expenses,⁴ though the responsibility for his other great wardrobe accounts was transferred from him to Walter Ralphs, first tailor of Richard as prince, then as king. Ralphs accounted for the great wardrobe from December 20, 1376, to September 28, 1377, that is to say for the end of Edward III.'s reign and the early months of the reign of Richard II.⁵

¹ See later, p. 458.

² *Enrolled Foreign Accounts*, p. 112; *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, xi. He was also described by Richard II. as "nadguere gardein de la garderobe de nostre trescher seigneur et ael le roy Edward . . . deinz nostre priue palais de Westminster"; *E.A.* 400/2.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1360-64, p. 228. *E.A.* 393/11, p. 63, shows him receiving wages from Farley at the wardrobe from June 1 to Nov. 1, 1360.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1377-81, pp. 28-29. Sleaford is called "keeper of the late king's wardrobe." See his accounts in *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)*, 4/23-26. They are also "tam pro arraione funeralium circa corpus dicti aui, quam pro sepultura eiusdem"; the last account ranges from June 21 to July 6, 1377, the date of burial, and on to June 2, 1378, when the transfer to Stokes was completed; cf. *E.A.* 400/1 and 2.

⁵ *For. Accts.* 3 Ric. II. A, 14/18 (really m. 1) makes this clear. Walter Ralphs or Rauf had been attached to the Black Prince's household before he entered that of Richard. He is described here as a citizen of London, but it is hard to be sure of the nationality or origin of the bearer of a patronymic. He could hardly have been the "Walter Rauf, king's sergeant," who on Nov. 4,

We must not lay too much stress on this curious reversion to ancient precedent, which recalls the days of Edward I. and Adenettus, especially as Ralphs continued to act as king's tailor for the whole reign, under various keepers, and seems to have lived contentedly, without thought of recapturing his sometime position of dignity. The successors of Sleaford and Ralphs, with the one exception of Richard Clifford already mentioned, were as mediocre as they. Next to Clifford in importance was Alan Stokes, who owed this promotion to his former service with the Black Prince.¹ He was keeper from 1377 to 1390, intermediate between Ralphs and Clifford. Clifford's successor, John Macclesfield, had been acting only for a few months when Richard was deposed. Macclesfield was a Cheshire clerk, who served Richard as zealously with his pen as the Cheshire archers did with their bows and arrows. A clerk of the privy seal, endowed with numerous, though not rich, benefices, Macclesfield kept the great wardrobe from April 10, 1398, to the king's deposition in

1379, was given a corrody at Malmesbury abbey. His exceptional favour was perhaps due to his marriage with Mundina Danes of Aquitaine, Richard II.'s nurse, as her second husband. On Mar. 15, 1378, he was granted for life Witley manor, Surrey, on the same terms on which it had been granted to Mundina. Compare *Foedera*, iv. 57, which commutes into money a grant to Mundina of the parish of Cadillac, near Fronsac. On May 1, 1380, Walter was granted the use of a house rent free, within the great wardrobe premises at Baynard's castle; *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 490. It was only on Oct. 26, 1379, that the exchequer was ordered to compute with him.

¹ Alan Stokes of the diocese of Lincoln had long been a clerk of Edward, prince of Wales. In 1349, and again in 1363, the prince petitioned the pope for his advancement; *C. Pap. Reg. Pet.* i. 154, 454. In 1363 he was dean of St. Burian's, Cornwall, and held that office till his death in 1393; *C.P.R.*, 1391-96, p. 349. For proceedings touching the audit of his account, see *M.R. K.R.* 156, breu. dir. bar. Trin. t. (mm. 26-29). It is easy to confuse him with his namesake, Sir Alan Stokes, knight, who appears in the issue rolls of 1374 as receiving large sums from the exchequer as agent or receiver of the Black Prince; *I.R.* 454, 455. The passage in the later roll, dated May 18, 1374, leaves no doubt as to his status: "Edwardo, principi Wallie. In denariis sibi liberatis per manus Alani de Stokes, militis, per duas vices m^l m^l delxvj*li*. xiijs. iiij*d*." An Alan Stokes was one of the executors of the Black Prince (Nichols, *Royal Wills*, p. 349), and I can find no evidence whether he was the clerk or the knight. Since, however, the knight, always an obscure figure, had now disappeared from the records, I incline to think that he was the clerk. This would account for his promotion to the great wardrobe by Richard. The "Alan de Stokes, one of the barons of the exchequer," appointed in 1380 to audit the accounts of the ministers of Wales and Cheshire (*C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 436) is clearly a slip for Richard Stokes, "dilectus clericus noster," appointed baron in 1377; *ib.* p. 31; *Foedera*, iv. 22.

1399.¹ He was then superseded by William Loveney, king's esquire.² Thus the end of our period coincided with the destruction of the clerical monopoly of the keepership of the great wardrobe.

In considering the subordinate officials of the great wardrobe, we must distinguish the office staff, never very large, from the tradesmen and craftsmen employed in the great wardrobe workshops. We hear little about the usher, or clerk of the spicery, who, in 1297, had been made the "controller" of the great wardrobe. He had served to link together the great wardrobe and the wardrobe of the household, for he was, of course, a wardrobe, not a great wardrobe, official, but it looks as though his duties in the great wardrobe lapsed, or became of little consequence, when, in 1324, the great wardrobe began to account to the exchequer.³

¹ The records speak of John Macclesfield the elder and John Macclesfield the younger, and there is danger of some confusion between the two. Both were clerks, presumably kinsmen, and the younger was always at hand to snap up any benefice which the elder happened to abandon. The Macclesfield in our text was clearly the elder. He was a clerk writing for the privy seal between 1384 and 1387 and probably longer; *I.R.* 505; *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, pp. 553, 582; *ib.*, 1385-89, p. 344. His benefices included Mackworth, Derbyshire, Barrow and Wilmslow, Cheshire, the wardenship of the hospital of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, a prebend of York, the provostship of Wells, and the wardenship of St. Anthony's hospital, London. For his relations to the last post, see Miss Rose Graham's paper on "St. Anthony's Hospital" to be published in the *Journal of the Archaeological Institute*. It looks as if the elder Macclesfield surrendered the headship of this landless house, dependent on alms, to the younger Macclesfield. However, in 1392 a commissioner of the bishop of Lincoln found, by inquest of twelve rectors, that this post was incompatible with his living of Denham, Bucks., which they therefore pronounced vacant; *Westminster Abbey Deeds*, No. 3436. (I owe this reference to Miss Graham.) Yet a John Macclesfield was still parson of Denham in 1398, when his servant was pardoned for housebreaking and rape; *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 429. I suspect this was the elder, put in the younger's place. The elder John was with Richard II. on his first, but not on his second Irish visit. He was appointed to the great wardrobe on Nov. 26, 1397, though his entry into office was delayed until Feb. 2, 1398, to give Clifford a chance of completing his account with deliberation; *ib.* p. 266. In actual fact Macclesfield only received his charge on Apr. 10. A John Macclesfield, commendator of St. Anthony's, had his "estate" in the provostship of Wells ratified by Henry IV.; *ib.*, 1399-1401, p. 4. The elder John was alive in 1406; *ib.*, 1405-8, p. 250.

² *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 5/11; *C.P.R.*, 1399-1401, p. 32.

³ There is extant a counter-roll of John Ferriby in Ousefleet's time, for coronation expenses in 1327; *E.A.* 383/6. No other controller occurs, and Ferriby himself was appointed *ad hoc*: "per eundem regem et consilium deputatus de diuersis rebus emptis, et expensis circa coronacionem dicti domini regis"; *E.A.* 383/6: "per visum et testimonium Johannis de Ferriby, clerici regis, contrarotulatoris ipsius Thome de providenciis pro eadem coronacione factis"; *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 3/9.

Yet it was, apparently, Zouch's experience as "clerk of the spicery" that procured his appointment as Ousefleet's successor in 1329.¹ The most dignified and influential member of the junior staff after 1324 seems to have been the personal clerk of the keeper. The office was not a new one, for as early as 1309 a legitimate reason for a bishop giving a beneficed clergyman licence for non-residence was that he might attend to the business of Ralph Stokes, clerk of the great wardrobe.² The duties of the office were so important, and gave such insight into the work of the department as a whole, that several of the clerks were promoted to the keepership. John Buckingham, for example, began his career as clerk of keeper Cross in 1338,³ and John Sleaford was clerk of keeper Newbury in 1359-61,⁴ perhaps even of his successor, Snaith.⁵ There were as well a number of other clerks of whose individuality and activity it is not easy to find details, but in 1328 there were six clerks of the great wardrobe receiving robes for their services,⁶ and usually a clerk and a yeoman were established as resident staff, wherever the great wardrobe planted a storehouse.

The heavy wages bill of the fourteenth century great wardrobe was largely accounted for by the many artificers and workmen. Some of them were permanently attached to the office, and were known as the king's craftsmen, with workrooms and lodgings set apart for their use. Others were more loosely associated, and worked at their own premises, trading chiefly on their own account, being only temporarily engaged when special need arose. Naturally both became more numerous when the Hundred Years' War increased the demands on the great wardrobe as an army clothing and military stores department, and the tendency then was for the "temporary" to become "regular." From the early years of the century there had been a few permanent king's artificers, as witnesses the ordinance of 1318, which definitely subjected the king's tailor, armourer, pavilioner and confectioner

¹ Zouch was "clericus speciarum regis" up to his appointment as keeper; *E.A.* 384/1 and 21.

² *Stapeldon's Register*, ed. Hingeston Randolph, p. 276; licence to Simon de Ashley for non-residence, "ut intendere valeret obsequiis domini Radulphi de Stokes, magne garderobe clerici."

³ *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 3/32.

⁴ *C.C.R., 1360-64*, p. 228.

⁵ He was credited, in Newbury's executors' accounts, with wages at 1s. a day for the 140 days he was "extra curiam."

⁶ *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 3/11.

of spices to the jurisdiction of the clerk-purveyor of the great wardrobe.¹

Although the king's tailor was no longer the important personage he had been in the days of Roger the Tailor and Adenettus, his office showed remarkable continuity. Edward III. had only three tailors in a reign of more than fifty years, and the first of them had served him while he was duke of Aquitaine.² Richard II. also kept on, when he became king, the tailor who had served him while he was prince of Wales. He was the Walter Ralphs who, between June 22 and September 28, 1378, followed the example of his early predecessors, Roger and Adenettus, in being responsible for the great wardrobe account.³ Ralphs may be taken as typical of his class. He had a shilling a day wages, with, after 1380, a house in the precincts of the great wardrobe, and served until the end of the reign.⁴ His *officium cissorie* boasted two *valetti*, each at sixpence a day, and was a sort of clothing factory. When the clothes had been made and packed in the great wardrobe, they were delivered *ad priuatam garderobam camere regis* or *in cameram regis*.⁵ The binding of the king's books was also one of the tailors' functions.⁶ Besides the king's tailors, the tailors of the king's nearer kinsfolk, especially of the younger offshoots of royalty who had not yet set up households for them-

¹ *Pl. Edw. II.* p. 275.

² Edward II.'s tailor, Henry of Cambridge, acted at least from 1323 to his master's deposition; *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 3/1 and 7. He must be distinguished from a king's clerk of the same name. Nicholas Wight, already "cissor ducis," became king's tailor at his master Edward III.'s accession and remained in office until Michaelmas 1340; *ib.* mm. 7, 9, 20, 32, 35. His successor, John Marreys, acted from Michaelmas 1340 to 1361 or 1362; *ib.* m. 36 and *ib.* 4/6. In 1348 Marreys, "king's yeoman," was appointed alnager, but, "because in attendance at the king's side," allowed to act by deputy; *C.P.R., 1348-50*, pp. 27-28. Yet in 1345-46 he had been "extra curiam" for 183 days; *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/44. Richard Carswell followed him, acting from 1362 to Edward III.'s death in 1377; *ib.* 4/6-26. In 1326 16 ells of cloth were allowed, "ad fenestras domus officii cissoris pro vento obstupandas"; *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 3/8.

³ Walter accounted until Alan Stokes, appointed on Sept. 25, entered on his duties on Sept. 29, 1377, "ante quod festum Walterus Raufe, scissor regis, inde computauit." It was only on Oct. 26, 1379, that the exchequer was ordered to compute with him; see also above, pp. 384-385, n. 5.

⁴ *E.A.* 402/16, 403/5.

⁵ *Ib.* 400/4, mm. 8-10.

⁶ *Ib.* 8, 10, and *ib.* 400/12. Walter used the remnants for bookbinding, "ad cooperiendum quinque libros domini regis . . . cum panno ad aurum . . . de diuersis remanenciis officii cissorie magne garderobe." They were all books of devotion.

selves, were also under the jurisdiction of the great wardrobe. There were the tailors of John of Eltham, the king's brother,¹ of Joan, the king's daughter,² and of the Black Prince, whose tailor, William Stretton, already at work in 1330,³ when his master was a baby, was still paid by the great wardrobe in 1347, when Edward had become prince of Wales and a warrior of reputation.⁴ In the same way queen Philippa's tailor, William of London, first appears in 1328, immediately after her marriage, and intermittently for the next twenty years,⁵ despite the queen's separate tailor's office in her wardrobe of La Réole.⁶ In 1370, after Philippa's death, John Stafford, up to then "intendant on her works in the office of tailor in La Réole, London," was assured the continuance of his life grant, on condition of being "intendant on the king's works as tailor, whenever required by the keeper."⁷

The growth of the separate wardrobe for arms and armour, known as the privy wardrobe in the Tower of London,⁸ did not take away entirely the king's armourers from the great wardrobe. Edward III.'s armourers, such as John of Cologne and William Standerwick,⁹ became, by reason of the great war, personages of importance, attached to the great wardrobe. Often several armourers were employed at once,¹⁰ but they were not, apparently,

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 3/11.

² *Ib.* 3/32.

³ *Ib.* m. 20.

⁴ *Ib.* m. 45.

⁵ *Ib.* 3/11, 30, 37, 45. W. London was a man of substance, king's sergeant, and married to a Surrey heiress; *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 57. In 1337-38 J. Bromley was also "cissor Philippe regine"; *ib.* m. 32.

⁶ See for this later, v. ch. xviii. § 1.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1367-70, p. 373.

⁸ See for this later, ch. xv.

⁹ John of Cologne was "armator regis" in 1329 and Standerwick in 1330; *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 3/13, 16d. In 1330 the king ordered the payment of £5 for the hire of houses in the city of London for his armour, John of Cologne; *Exch. of R., War. for Issue*, 2/11. Standerwick also had a workshop provided in 1334. Both were acting in 1337-38, when each had a house hired "pro officio suo"; *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 2/7, 3/30. The charges for Cologne's workshop were still being made in 1351 (*E.A.* 392/4). Here Cologne's "hospicium" was described as the place "in quo opera domini regis et alia diuersa perficiebantur." Compare *Warrants for Issue*, file 10. Cologne accounted to the king, as armourer, from 7 to 28 Edward III.; *Pipe*, 207/51 (36 Edw. III.). In Aug. 1337 he had licence to crenellate his houses in Cornhill; *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 505. If his workshop was one of these, it must have been of considerable size and strength. Standerwick died before Mar. 1345, when Cologne and others succeeded him in some of his offices; *ib.*, 1343-45, p. 446.

¹⁰ So early as 1329 we read of Peterkin of Bruges and Thomas Copham as well as the two mentioned in the text; *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 3/13. From 1335 William le Hauberger began to figure, *ib.* m. 28. In 1340-41 five "armatores regis" are mentioned; *ib.* m. 36.

all of equal standing; some one or two were clearly chief armourers. By 1360 William Glendale had succeeded Cologne as *armator pro corpore domini regis*,¹ and the last person to hold this office under Edward III. was Thomas Carleton, from 1368 onwards.² Even when the armourers came to be described as "the king's armourers in the Tower of London," they continued to figure in the wage lists of the great wardrobe. Thus William Snell acted under Richard II. up to about 1395, when he was succeeded by Stephen Frith, who remained in office for the rest of the reign.

The king's pavilioner also was a man of position and maintained a close connection with the great wardrobe. Mr. John Yaxley, or Yakesley, king's sergeant, who had already acted under Edward II.,³ was, in 1329, reappointed pavilioner or keeper of the king's tents,⁴ and remained in office nearly until his death in 1357, when he left to his wife a not inconsiderable property.⁵ His successor, Adam of Sherborne, was in office in 1352-53,⁶ and beyond February 28, 1358.⁷ As he soon afterwards vacated his office, he may be identified with the Adam Sherborne who, on March 30, 1358, "for his good service," was sent to the convent of Sherborne, Dorset, with a corrody for maintenance for life.⁸ Then Thomas Thornton was appointed king's pavilioner on June 12, 1359,⁹ and remained in office till Edward III.'s death.¹⁰ Under Richard II. the pavilioners were John Ward (1377-1385), John Savage (1385-1395), and William Wyncelow (1395-1399).¹¹

In the course of the fourteenth century other craftsmen, in addition to those mentioned in 1318, were gradually associated with the great wardrobe, Richard II.'s taste for sumptuous garments and furniture, like his grandfather's delight in armour, helping to swell the wages list. From the office of armourer branched off the offices of the king's *erubigator* or polisher of arms,¹² his *lanceator*, his *galeator*, his *atillator* or maker of crossbows, and more curiously, his *broudator* or embroiderer. In 1332 John of Cologne

¹ *E.A.* 393/11, 15. ² *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 4/16; *E.A.* 396/18, 397/16.

³ *C.C.R.*, 1323-27, p. 372. ⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1327-30, p. 393.

⁵ *Calendar of London Wills*, i. 695. His will is dated Dec. 28, 1356, and was proved on May 6, 1357. See also Riley, *Memorials of London*, pp. 183-185.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1350-54, pp. 251, 442.

⁷ *Ib.*, 1358-61, p. 15.

⁸ *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 505.

⁹ *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 231; compare *ib.* p. 235, and *E.A.* 393/15.

¹⁰ *Ib.* 397/16.

¹¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 4 *passim*.

¹² Gerard des Armes long held this post under Edward III.

included *brodaria* among his functions,¹ and William Glendale, who had been armourer, appeared later as *broudator regis*.² About the same time the office of king's *tapicer* emerged, to which were assigned the same wages as the embroiderer enjoyed.³ Under Richard II. the king's embroiderer became a permanent official,⁴ so necessary to Richard's comfort that Richard took him with him to Ireland. There were also the king's goldsmiths, and on March 25, 1398, Christopher Tyldesley, goldsmith of London, was thus named by patent in succession to John Harsey, deceased.⁵ Nor must we omit Gilbert Prince, painter and citizen of London,⁶ who appears in nearly all the accounts of the reign, except the last, by which time he seems to have been succeeded by his probable kinsman, Thomas Litlington, alias Thomas Prince, painter and citizen of London, whom the king took to Ireland in 1399.⁷ So far as the great wardrobe accounts reveal the occupation of these artists, it seems to have been mainly decorative work, such as the emblazoning of arms and devices on banners, and the preparation of appropriate embellishments for tournaments, masquerades and other festivities.⁸ Sometimes the king's saddler figured among the artificers.⁹ Most of the artisans were described as "king's yeomen," but many of them plied their trade for other customers besides the king. To the staff of clerks and craftsmen at headquarters we must add, in calculating the size

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 3/21.

² *Ib.* 4/23, "nuper broudator regis" in 1372.

³ *Ib.* 4/23. John Bullock of London, "tapicerius regis," was assigned, in 1372, the same wages of a shilling a day that Glendale "nuper broudator" had had.

⁴ Richard's "broudatores" were Hans of Strassburg (1377-89), William Sanston (1389-96), and Robert Ashcombe (1396-99). Hans of Strassburg, despite his name, was a responsible London citizen, whose daughter inherited from him lands and tenements without Aldgate; *Cal. Letter Bks. London*, H. p. 339.

⁵ *C.P.R., 1396-99*, pp. 319, 333.

⁶ See too *ib.*, 1391-96, pp. 170, 178. He was a parishioner of St. Giles', Cripplegate.

⁷ *Ib.*, 1396-99, p. 573. Cf. *E.A.* 403/5.

⁸ *E.A.* 401/4: "Gilberto Prince, pictori London . . . Pro diuersis operibus per ipsum factis pro agisamentis et ludis regis, tam apud Eltham quam apud Wyndesore, contra festa natalicia Domini, annis vij^o et viij^o. Cf. *ib.* 401/5 "pro operibus circa vapulationem diuersorum baneriorum de armis diuersorum dominorum et dominarum contra diem exequiarum ducisse Brittanie." In *ib.* 402/13, Prince is "pictor regis."

⁹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/20d, 26, 32, 36, 37, 42, mention, between 1330 and 1345, William Pykerell, king's sergeant, as "sellator regis." He was a London saddler; *C.P.R., 1334-48*, p. 280.

of the establishment of the great wardrobe, the labourers employed by these small masters. So important was the question of the wages to be paid to them that the government of Richard II. broke its own laws when it instructed keeper Clifford in 1390 to pay his workmen their accustomed wages, notwithstanding the provision to the contrary, in the statute of Cambridge of 1388, with regard to the wages of carpenters and other labourers.¹ Like their superior, the king's tailor, the armourer, the pavilioner and the embroiderer were all appointed by patent.

There were also persons appointed to act as prisers and purveyors under the keeper. In the early years of Edward I. subordinate agents of the clerk or keeper were still commissioned "to make purchases for the wardrobe."² When the great wardrobe became more fully localised in the fourteenth century, there was even more need of a swarm of subordinate agents to visit the various fairs and markets.³ Besides the ordinary great wardrobe staff, both English and foreign merchants were appointed to provide commodities for the use of the great wardrobe. Thus, at the end of his reign, Edward I. sent Reginald of Thunderley, citizen and merchant of London, to Flanders to make provision there of cloth for his great wardrobe.⁴ Again, in 1318, the king's merchant, Anthony Usedemer, a Genoese, "undertook to make provision for the great wardrobe," and, to recoup himself for his expenses, he was assigned the great custom

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. & H.)* 5/5. See above, iii. 440.

² *C.P.R.*, 1281-92, p. 147, a safe conduct until Easter for Stephen of Westbury and his men, commissioned by Hamo de la Legh, king's clerk, to make purchases for the wardrobe, dated Dec. 27, 1284; *ib.*, 1292-1301, p. 480, which records the appointment, during pleasure, of four persons to make purveyances for the great wardrobe on condition that they answered therefor in the usual way (Nov. 21, 1299). Of the four persons appointed, two were citizens of London, and one was a merchant of Lucca. Each had a separate commission, the two Englishmen to purvey cloths, and wax and furs respectively, the Italian to purvey sandal, cloth of gold, broadcloths, towels, linen and canvas, and the fourth, also probably a foreigner, to purvey sugar, groceries and electuaries; *ib.*, 1301-7, p. 337, a safe conduct, dated May 5, 1305, for a merchant of Ypres, purveying cloth for the great wardrobe.

³ The strict subordination of the great wardrobe to the wardrobe proper is illustrated by the fact that, so late as 1301, buyers, sent out to procure cloth, spice and similar great wardrobe commodities, were still commissioned in the name of the keeper of the wardrobe, not of the great wardrobe; see *C.P.R.*, 1301-7, pp. 3, 96, 201, 305. The employment, in 1295, of the keeper Roger de Lisle in paying troops and sailors is another evidence of the great wardrobe officer being still available, upon occasion, to discharge general wardrobe business; *M.B.E.*, *T. of R.*, 202/11, 25.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1307-13, p. 148.

of the port of Boston.¹ All goods imported into England, whether by natives or by foreigners, were liable to prisage for the great wardrobe. For example, in 1360, the collectors of the petty customs in London were ordered not to allow cloth or other commodities, required by the great wardrobe, to be opened or delivered until they had been brought to the wool-wharf and until the clerk of the great wardrobe had had view thereof, and taken what he thought fit for the king's use. To enable the keeper to perform this duty, notice was to be given to him when such merchandise came into port.²

We must now turn from the staffing of the great wardrobe to its housing, and in the course of considering its wanderings and settlement, we shall be able to record such events in its external history as have not already been examined. Throughout the early stages of great wardrobe development, two contradictory influences contended with each other. As a part of the king's household, the natural inclination of the great wardrobe was to follow the court: as a warehouse and factory, and only less so as an administrative office, it was most desirable, from motives of economy and convenience, that it should have fixed headquarters. The result of this conflict was that the peripatetic great wardrobe following the court gradually became a government office, practically "out of court," with a home of its own in the city of London.

In the reign of Henry III., when the office was still in the making, there were signs that the struggle had begun. Quite early the great wardrobe found it convenient to be established in the Tower of London for long periods, though it was always liable to follow the court when it quitted the neighbourhood of the capital, as we have seen, for instance, when it went to Winchester and to Chester to suit Henry III.³ Under Edward I. the great wardrobe still often occupied the Tower, but from

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1317-21, p. 69; cf. *ib.* p. 124, which shows that Anthony was a member of a Genoese society of merchants in the king's service. The name is "Usus Maris," "Use de mer." Anthony came to England with Antonio di Passano and others in 1311; *ib.*, 1307-13, p. 378. For Passano, see above, ii. 315.

² *C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 26. The wool-wharf was in the Tower ward; Stow, *Survey of London*, i. 108.

³ See above, p. 362.

1275-76, Adenettus the Tailor hired a house in London, in which part of the "harness" and robes of the king could be kept.¹

The great wardrobe was more peripatetic under Edward I. than under his father, notwithstanding its long visits to London and the Tower. It must have followed the king during his long and difficult campaign against the Welsh rebels in 1295, when the then keeper, Roger de Lisle, was actively engaged in business so much outside his own department as the paying of wages to soldiers and sailors.² During the Scottish wars the great wardrobe moved in wider circles still. It was, for example, transferred from Berwick to Dunfermline when Edward I. took up his residence in the latter town in January 1304,³ and it was *in partibus Lincolnie* with Edward I. in April 1305.⁴

Perpetual transport of bulky and perishable articles was both costly and troublesome. The armour and arms required for court use had obviously to be taken wherever the king had need of them, and we accordingly notice recurring payments for the moving of the *hernesia garderober* from place to place. From the earliest date, however, a distinction had been drawn between what was required for immediate consumption and what could be stored. The cost of carriage, when the court moved rapidly or when it was in hostile country, could be minimised by billeting the great wardrobe temporarily at a neighbouring town of importance or at the base of operations. For instance, in 1307, when Edward I. was at Lanercost, the great wardrobe remained at Carlisle,⁵ and during the northern wars both Carlisle and Berwick were frequently its headquarters.

When the Scottish wars were renewed under Edward III.

¹ *Chanc. Misc.* 3/11 shows this for 4-6 Edward I. at least.

² *M.B.E., T. of R.*, 302/17. He was paying sailors' wages on a still larger scale later in the year after his return to England, disbursing £3730 : 13 : 4 to the Yarmouth fleet between May 14 and Aug.; *ib. f.* 24. See also *ib. f.* 31 for the large sums which passed through his hands. Was it because Lisle's occupation was extra departmental, that an "emptor," Walter of Windsor, received 6½d. per diem for the whole of 23 Edw. I.; *ib. f.* 11?

³ *MS. Ad.* 35,293, f. 43; a payment to Ralph Stokes "pro cariagio magne garderober de Berewyco usque Dunfermline" on Jan 28, 1304.

⁴ *E.A.* 309/7. The suggestion, in the index of *C.P.R.*, 1301-7, p. 752, that the great wardrobe was at Portsmouth in 1306, is not borne out by the text, p. 432.

⁵ *Ib.* 370/13, order of Droxford to Stokes the keeper, dated Feb. 21, 1307, to send to Lanercost "figues et raisins et autre fruit qe vous avez en vostre garde a Cardoill."

the practice of his grandfather's reign was continued. In 1327, and again in 1333, the exigencies of that warfare caused the transference of the royal household and the administration to York, and the great wardrobe followed the court to the north. In 1327-28 it was located in St. Leonard's hospital at York, and on March 10, 1328, parts of its stores were carried by water to Torksey and thence to Lincoln,¹ but by 1329 the *hospicium magne garderobe* was again in London, in Lombard Street, whence articles were sent to the itinerating wardrobe with the court.² In 1333-37, after a short stay at Newcastle,³ the great wardrobe spent a considerable time at York. There two houses were hired, from Richard of Brikenhale and William of Grantham, for the office of the great wardrobe, from January 25, 1333, to August 18, 1334, the date when keeper Zouch laid down his office.⁴ Beche, the next keeper, paid rent for certain houses in York from July 25, 1334, to April 1, 1335,⁵ and we have no reason to believe that they were different houses from those used by his predecessor. Similarly, from April 1335 to Michaelmas 1337, the period covered by keeper Norwell's account, the office of the great wardrobe rented quarters at York.⁶ There was, however, a London storehouse for part, if not for the whole, of this period,⁷ and

¹ *Ib.* 383/19, also gives its subsequent itinerary to London by land and thence to Worcester. As Ousefleet paid rent for the whole of 1327 for the London house, and sent the necessities for Edward II.'s funeral from London to Gloucester, it looks as if the great wardrobe went to York later than the other offices. See my *Captivity and Death of Edward of Carnarvon*, p. 30 (M.U.P., 1920).

² *Ib.* 384/6.

³ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/24d, enumerates the expenses for the carriage of the great wardrobe articles from London, York and Newcastle "ad diuersas partes Anglie et marchie Scocie" and also "pro diuersis custubus et expensis factis circa cariagium garderobe predictae de Nouo Castro usque Eboracum per vices infra tempus compoti." This was in 7 Edw. III. "Et in vadiis unius clerici et unius valetti morancium, tam apud Eboracum quam apud Nouum Castrum super Tynam, super custodia magne garderobe predictae et faciencium ibidem liberationes per iiij^{xx} dies."

⁴ *Ib.* : "Et in duobus hospiciis locatis de Ricardo de Brikenhale et Willelmo de Grantham in ciuitate Eboraci pro officio magne garderobe regis per unum annum et dimidium et xxij dies, videlicet de die xxv^o Jan., anno vij^o incipiente, usque diem xvij^m Augusti, anno viij^o . . . vij li xiiij s iiij d."

⁵ *Ib.* 3/27: "Et in denariis solutis pro quibusdam domibus per ipsum locatis apud Eboracum, ubi dicta magna garderoba hospitabatur infra tempus huius compoti."

⁶ *Ib.* m. 28: "Et in uno hospicio locato apud Eboracum pro officio magne garderobe per tempus huius compoti, vij li x s."

⁷ This is shown by Norwell incurring expenses for the repair of the houses in Lombard St., London; *E.A.* 366/4.

there was sometimes a subsidiary establishment at Newcastle.¹ Though Norwell paid rent at York, the whole of the great wardrobe seems to have been removed more than once during his term of office.² After Michaelmas 1337, when Thomas Cross had succeeded Norwell as keeper, London was apparently again its headquarters, but only for a few months, as events fell out.

The great wardrobe and its keeper often accompanied the king in his journeys across the sea. We have seen that, in 1286, Hamo de la Legh went with Edward I. to France, and that, when he died abroad in the next year, Roger de Lisle was appointed on the spot. In the early years of Edward III. the keepers themselves also made short journeys beyond sea to obtain cloth for the great wardrobe. In 1332 keeper Zouch spent twenty-five days, and in 1333 forty - two days, in Flanders, on such missions.³ Then, when continental war broke out, the department as a whole went abroad. Thomas Cross, keeper of the great wardrobe, was with Edward III. during his absence from England between 1338 and 1340, and from September 30, 1338 to October 1, 1339, the great wardrobe was stationed at Antwerp, where a house was hired for its accommodation.⁴ Antwerp was, indeed, the great wardrobe headquarters as long as the king was in the Netherlands, but when Edward III. set out upon the campaign of the Thiérache in September 1339, a portion, at least, of the great wardrobe itinerated with him throughout the expedition, being conveyed

¹ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/28: "Et in vadiis unius clerici et unius valetti, continue morancium apud Londonias, Eboracum et Nouum Castrum super Tynam, super custodia dicte garderobe et faciencium liberaciones ibidem, tam pro corpore regis quam aliorum per dxlvj dies, xxxvj li viij s." Compare m. 30 for similar charges going on till Sept. 1337.

² *Ib.* 3/28: "Et in portagio . . . necnon pro cariagio facto circa remocionem tocius magne garderobe per vices infra tempus huius compoti, unacum locacione domorum pro predicta garderoba, lxxix li. viij s. iiij d. et ob."

³ *Ib.* 3/21d. 24d. For this he received small "vadia extra feudum."

⁴ *Ib.* 3/32, shows a house hired at Antwerp for the great wardrobe from July 15 to Oct. 1, 1338. Compare *ib.* m. 34 (13 Edw. III.): "Et pro quodam hospicio locato apud Andwerpe in dictis partibus Brabancie pro officio magne garderobe infra hospitando inter ultimum diem Septembris, anno dicto incipiente, usque xv^m diem Augusti proximum sequentem, per xlv septimanas et quattuor dies, antequam rex iter suum arripuit de ibidem versus partes Francie, xxj li vij s vj d." The stages to Antwerp were London, Ipswich and the sea.

in three carts bought for the purpose.¹ In addition, stores were kept and liveries made, at London, Ipswich and even on the high seas.² No doubt there were also English local warehouses near the chief fairs, like the wardrobe at St. Ives, to which reference has already been made. A little later we find various dépôts, scattered, conveniently for military operations, over Flanders, Brabant and northern France. From among these branches, Bruges and Mechlin may be singled out for special notice.³ The reason for such a measure is obvious, for the great wardrobe, in peace time the storehouse for clothing, armour and other such commodities, in war time became the department for clothing, arms, armour, luxuries and certain kinds of provisions for the army, and had, therefore, to have its dumps wherever the army needed supplies. The staff at each was a clerk, at a shilling, and a yeoman, at fourpence, a day.⁴ The habit of turning court departments into military offices was discontinued gradually, after the Netherlandish campaigns. During the Crécy campaign the great wardrobe remained in England,⁵ but in the campaign of 1359-60, part of the great wardrobe may have been abroad with the king.

From the latter part of the reign of Edward I., at least, there was always in London a storehouse and a factory connected with the great wardrobe, with a minimum staff of one clerk and one yeoman. As we have already pointed out, this depot seems usually to have been in the Tower, whence, as in 1290, stores of armour and other "harness of the wardrobe" as well as rice, almonds, sugar and other great wardrobe commodities, were

¹ *Ib.* 3/34: "Et in tribus carrettis emptis cum toto apparatu et ix equis emptis pro predicta garderoba cum rege de partibus Flandrie et Brabancie versus partes Francie carrianda, xxv li x s."

² *Ib.* m. 32. The operations extended for the whole time of this account. Was it because of the great wardrobe's mobility that John of Cologne, the king's armourer, was "extra curiam" for the whole of 1340 and received a sum "pro quodam hospicio locato per idem tempus" (i.e. 14 Edw. III.) "in quo opera regis predicta et alia consimilia de precepto suo perficiebantur." For armour making, a fixed workshop was clearly necessary; *E.A.* 389/4.

³ *Ib.* 3/34.

⁴ *Ib.* 3/34: "et in vadiis unius clerici et unius valetti, morancium in diuersis locis in diuersis partibus Flandrie, Brabancie et Francie super custodia garderobe predictae et facientium ibidem diuersas liberaciones." For the chief wardrobe centres compare *M.B.E.*, *T. of R.*, 203/177-188d *et passim*, "liberaciones garderobe 12-16 Edw. III." The total "prestita" to Cross from the wardrobe amounted to £2395:6:5½.

⁵ *Ib.* 3/44.

transferred to Westminster or elsewhere for the king's use.¹ Yet in 1288-89, Edward I. had a local great wardrobe at Westminster, divided into compartments.² By the end of the reign the great wardrobe was so far differentiated from the household that it needed more elaborate accommodation of its own. The Tower might still partially serve for this, especially as far as the arms and armour were concerned, but the cloth and spices needed separate storage, and although this could be found in the Tower, and often was, it was considered wise to hire houses for the purpose as well, in some spot in the city of London. We find in 1299-1300 a house hired in London and charged for in Stokes' accounts, for Robinet the king's tailor, but this was a storehouse as well as a workshop.³ Again, on April 5, 1311, a royal writ ordered the mayor and aldermen of London to deliver to Ingelard Warley, keeper of the wardrobe, for the purposes of the king's wardrobe, certain houses, formerly belonging to William Carleton, deceased.⁴ These houses were not specifically said to be for the use of the great wardrobe, but it is difficult to see for what else they could have been needed, and in 1311, of course, the great wardrobe was still strictly subordinate to the keeper of the wardrobe.

Ousefleet's accounts throw much light on the location of the great wardrobe in the latter part of the reign of Edward II. From 1323 to 1326 Ousefleet spent £3 : 6 : 8 a year for the rent of a certain house hired in the city of London for the storing and safe-custody of articles bought for the great wardrobe.⁵ The phraseology varied from year to year. In one year goods deposited

¹ *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5f. 9d. A payment of 12s. 6d. to John Droxford, then "ostiarus", for the carriage of the articles enumerated in the text and similar commodities "de turri Londoniarum usque Westmonasterium tempore parliamenti in estate."

² *Pipe*, 134/2: "Computus J. le Conuers de operacionibus factis in interclusis in magna garderoba regis apud Westmonasterium." "Great" may, of course, not be used here in the technical sense.

³ *L.Q.G.* p. 355: "pro diuersis operibus factis per Robinettum, cissorem regis . . . pro diuersis, ad officium dicti Robinetti spectantibus, imponendis et custodiendis."

⁴ *Cal. Let. Books, London*, D. p. 254. In April, the houses were delivered to Warley's attorney in the presence of Henry Segrave, who was lodged therein.

⁵ *E.A.* 379/13, 380/15 and 381/10; cf. *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/1d, 5: "Et in quodam hospicio, infra ciuitatem Londonie, hoc anno locato, pro pannis et aliis rebus officii predicti attrahendis de locis ubi prius fuerant, ibidem custodiendis Londoniis et alibi ad mandata regis."

there were said to have been kept in the house only until they were carried to the Tower or elsewhere, by the king's command.¹ Yet in another year, July 8, 1325, to July 7, 1326, the house was used as a lodging for the clerk of the great wardrobe and his household.² The house referred to was, no doubt, the same as that described by Ousefleet, in another account, as the *hospicium garderober in Bassingeshawe*.³ Bassishaw ward, of which the modern Basinghall is a corruption, was a convenient locality for the great wardrobe to be stationed in, because within it were situated Weavers' Hall and Bakewell Hall, the weekly market places for woollen cloth.⁴

Our texts prove that in the latter part of Edward II.'s reign the great wardrobe had a resting-place at Bassishaw, capable not only of storing its commodities, but of housing the whole official staff if need be. The same house was still so used in the first year of Edward III.'s reign, though it was then more briefly described as appointed for the "office of the great wardrobe."⁵ We know, too, that Ousefleet kept in the Tower a large store of jewels and plate, as well as his arms and armour,⁶ and since the office itself occupied the Tower at least twice during the first seventeen years of Edward III.'s reign,⁷ it is not impossible that it stayed there sometimes under Edward II.

Three circumstances in the early years of Edward III.'s reign combined to help forward the localisation of the great wardrobe

¹ "Quousque ad Turrim Londoniensem vel alibi ad mandatum regis carriabantur"; *E.A.* 380/15; compare *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/1, 5.

² "Item in uno hospicio etc. . . . necnon pro clerico eiusdem officii et familia sua hospitandis"; *E.A.* 381/10.

³ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/5: "Et in carriagio . . . et portagio eiusdem de hospicio garderober in Bassingeshawe usque Billingesgate" and thence to Dover and elsewhere. Billingsgate was simply the place where great wardrobe commodities were shipped, doubtless from the Wool-wharf in Lower Thames Street, on the site of the east end of the present Customs' House; Stow, *Survey of London*, ed. Kingsford, i. 108, 135-136.

⁴ Stow, *Survey of London*, ed. Kingsford, i. 288. Stow speaks elsewhere (i. 282) of a large ancient building of stone, between the Old Jewry and Ironmonger Lane, which "in my youth was called the old wardrobe." If this were the Bassishaw wardrobe, it was not in Basinghall ward, though close to it, but in the wards of Cheap and Colman Street. This may be a confused tradition of the Bassishaw storehouse, or it may indicate another possible site of the great wardrobe in its many wanderings.

⁵ *E.A.* 383/3: "In quodam hospicio locato Londoniis pro officio magne garderober"; *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/9.

⁶ *Cal. and Invent. of Exch.* iii. 123.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 94 for 1346, and *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 324 for Oct. 1351.

in premises of its own in the city of London. The first was the great wardrobe's gradual drifting away from the court. In the beginning the keeper received wages only when *extra curiam*, but in 1327 Ousefleet drew his salary for the whole year.¹ The ideal of the ordinance of 1323, that the keeper of the great wardrobe should reside at court as much as possible,² was evidently no longer realisable, and soon ceased even to be an ideal, for we find Ousefleet's successors taking their wages irrespective of their whereabouts. When the head of the great wardrobe was no longer a resident member of the household, it was more necessary than ever that he and his subordinates should have a permanent home of their own.

Secondly, the same years witnessed a great development of activity among the royal craftsmen employed in the great wardrobe. We have already noted how, in earlier times, the king's tailor constantly plied his trade under the keeper's direction, and how, from time to time, a *hospicium* was hired for his accommodation. The rolls of the first few years of Edward III. show that besides the tailor,³ the king's armourers,⁴ often three or four in number, the king's tentmaker and the king's saddler were all similarly engaged, and provided with workshops whose rent was a charge upon the great wardrobe account.⁵ Although these workshops were by no means necessarily, or even generally, identical with the office of the great wardrobe, they were nearly always in, or near, the city of London, and forged another link in the strong chain connecting the great wardrobe with the capital.

In the third place these years saw the slow extrusion of the great wardrobe from the Tower, because of the growth of a separate wardrobe office specifically connected with that fortress, the "king's privy wardrobe in the Tower of London," the rise and development of which will be considered in the next chapter. That department was, on the one side, an offshoot of the great wardrobe, which severed its connection with the Tower

¹ *E.A.* 383/9.

² Ousefleet went abroad with Edward II. in 1325; *C.P.R.*, 1324-27, p. 169.

³ See *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/32, where Cross accounted to Nicholas Wight for a house, "per ipsum locata pro officio super tempus huius compoti."

⁴ See, for instance, *E.A.* 389/4, quoted above, p. 397, n. 2.

⁵ See above, pp. 390-392.

when the daughter office had made herself independent of the parent, and needed more space for expansion.¹ More precisely, we may say that certain types of great wardrobe commodities, notably arms and armour, were withdrawn altogether from the custody of the keeper of the great wardrobe, and guarded and maintained by a special organisation.

From the end of Edward III.'s first year, for the next few years, though rent was allowed to armourers for their houses, there is, in the great wardrobe accounts, no entry of rent paid for the *hospicium magne garderobe*. Nevertheless, the constant charges for the carriage of goods, from the shops where they were bought to the office of the great wardrobe, show that such a house was still used.² When military considerations made it advisable for the headquarters of the great wardrobe to be removed from London for the greater part of seven years, settlement within the city might well have been checked.³ Yet it is a remarkable proof of the attraction of London, that these years of absence saw the great wardrobe provided there with permanent and adequate quarters.

Since 1318 the Florentine merchants of the society of the Bardi had established their London house in Lombard Street. From the north side their spacious property extended to Cornhill, had a garden of its own,⁴ and occupied a good deal of the ground between the two streets, on a site a little to the west of Birchin Lane.⁵ Early in 1328, Edward III. bought of the Bardi their messuage in Lombard Street, for £700.⁶ These were the premises at which the Bardi handed over 1000 marks each calendar month from December 1 onwards for the expenses of the household.⁷ Before October 26, 1331, we know that the king had

¹ For example, see *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 321.

² For example, *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/16d.

³ See above, pp. 394-396.

⁴ *E.A.* 392/4.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1317-21, p. 246, recites the grant dated Dec. 1, 1318. See also Stow, i. 201, 203.

⁶ *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 362; *ib.* pp. 378-379, memorandum of delivery, on May 14, of sixty-two charters concerning the house, from the Bardi to the king. Questions of title must have been pretty complicated when so many documents went with a single messuage.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 228; payments were to be "in the city of London to the keeper of our great wardrobe." This shows that the wardrobe of the household used, upon occasion, the great wardrobe headquarters as a convenient office of receipt.

assigned these houses for the custody of the great wardrobe,¹ but a difficulty presented itself. The great financier, William de la Pole, who had been allowed by the king to occupy the ancient mansion of the Bardi, was apparently unwilling to resign it, because before October 14, 1333, the keeper of the great wardrobe had hired certain houses in the city, for the accommodation of his office, for so long as the Lombard Street house remained in Pole's hands.²

The movements of the great wardrobe in London for the next few years are difficult to unravel. In 1337 we find keeper Norwell spending money in repairing and improving the houses and chambers of the office in Lombard Street.³ Possibly Pole was still in occupation of part, if not the whole, of the premises, especially as it is unlikely the modest wants of the great wardrobe in London, when its headquarters were at York and were soon to be in Brabant, demanded all the space furnished by the large Bardi house. Yet the inference that the great wardrobe's London office was actually then established in Lombard Street is irresistible.

Pole's continued tenancy of the house there would be intelligible in the light of his increasingly intimate relations with the royal household and the part he took in financing the king. From Michaelmas 1335, onwards, he agreed to pay £10 daily to the keeper of the wardrobe for the expenses of the household,⁴

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1330-33, pp. 364-365; recognition of rent-charge of five marks a year, due in respect of the house, and order to the exchequer to pay it, since no issues were now received from the said houses, "since the king had assigned them for the custody of his great wardrobe."

² *Enr. Accs. (W. and H.)* 3/35 . . . "per breue de priuato sigillo, datum xiv^o die Oct., anno regni regis Edwardi III. septimo, in quo continetur quod prefatus clericus locauit domos pro officio dicte garderobe infra dictam ciuitatem, tempore quo domus ipsius regis in Lumbardestreete fuerunt in manu W. de la Pole."

³ *E.A.* 388/4: "ad emendacionem et reparacionem domorum et camerarum officii magne garderobe regis in Londoniis in Lumbardestreete." The works included building foundations, wages of plasterers, tylers, plumbers, and the cost of rafters, tiles, lead, etc. There was also a sum "pro factura cuiusdam gurgitis inter dictum hospicium et hospicium Nicholai de Wyght." Two carpenters were employed at this for two days at a cost of 5d. Wight was the king's tailor. This possibly points to a permanent tailor's establishment, nearly adjoining the great wardrobe office. The total cost of the operations was £23 : 8 : 6. On the back of the account is a transcript of a letter of privy seal ordering the exchequer to make reasonable allowances to Norwell for his work, dated May 20, 1336. Compare *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 2/7d.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1334-38, p. 265.

so that at the moment every wardrobe department was largely dependent on him for supplies. His financial assistance was so indispensable that he had only to ask to receive, and on November 14, 1338, Edward promised at Antwerp to indemnify him by the cession of the Lombard Street house.¹ Next year, on September 27, 1339, when on the point of beginning his invasion of France, Edward granted Pole the whole of the Bardi's house in fee, "in consideration of his great assistance to the king."² The protracted absence of the central great wardrobe from London between 1333 and 1340 eased the situation.

By the early part of 1340 keeper Cross brought back the headquarters of the great wardrobe to London, whence they were hardly ever afterwards removed. Yet continental obligations could not altogether be shaken off at once, and in 1343 Cross was still paying rent for a house in Bruges, where purchases were stored until they could be forwarded to England.³ As the houses in Lombard Street were no longer available, Cross hired, from Michaelmas 1339, onwards, "certain houses" in the city for his office.⁴ We are definitely informed that in the next year, Michaelmas 1340 to Michaelmas 1341, this new *hospicium* was the house of Andrew Aubrey in Milk Street, Cheapside, and that the office remained there for the whole of that year.⁵

Where the great wardrobe was for the next twelve months is not quite clear, though Cross's expenses for 1343-44 show charges for conveying commodities from the Tower to Westminster, which suggest that the Tower was still to some extent at his disposal.⁶ Before July 25, 1343, the great wardrobe was back again in Pole's house in Lombard Street,⁷ and somewhere about the same time

¹ *Foedera*, ii. 1065; *Rot. Orig. Abb.* ii. 123, 128.

² *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 394. The grant is dated Marcoing in the Cambrésis.

³ *E.A.* 389/14: "pro quodam domo conducta apud Brugges in qua res predictae empte in partibus transmarinis hospitabantur . . . quousque mittebantur versus Angliam." They were kept at Bruges from Nov. to Jan. Nearly all the "empeiones" of 16 Edw. III. were made in Flanders; *ib.* 390/1.

⁴ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)*, 3/35: "et in quibusdam domibus locatis in ciuitate Londoniarum pro officio garderobe predictae infra hospitando . . . per totum tempus huius compoti, tempore quo domus ipsius regis in Lumbardestrete fuerunt in manu Willelmi de la Pole." The keeper's warranty for hiring was the writ of privy seal of Oct. 14, 1333, quoted in n. 2, p. 402.

⁵ *Ib.* 3/36: "Et in uno hospicio locato Londoniis de Andrea Aubrey in Milkestrete pro officio dicte magne garderobe infra hospitando et faciendo per totum tempus huius compoti."

⁶ *E.A.* 390/5.

⁷ *Ib.* 389/14.

keeper Cross spent over five pounds in improving the property.¹ There the great wardrobe remained until the spring of 1346, though its resident staff was sometimes reduced to the minimum of one clerk and a yeoman.² On March 12 of that year Edward III. once more "gave back" to Pole the houses in Lombard Street "which had been taken into the king's hands," and directed keeper Cook to "cause the same wardrobe which is now in the said houses . . . to be carried to the Tower of London and put back there again."³ Nevertheless, the great wardrobe was, in 1348, again established in Lombard Street.

A fresh complication ensued. On August 6, 1348, the king refounded his palace chapel of St. Stephen's, Westminster, as a college for a dean and twelve canons. In the patent of foundation he granted the college his great inn in Lombard Street, to be held in frankalmoin.⁴ A few days later, Thomas Cross, formerly keeper of the great wardrobe, was made dean of St. Stephen's chapel, an appointment which may explain the alienation of the Lombard Street property from the crown.⁵ The only result was that the canons of St. Stephen's received a rent of £5 a year from the keeper of the great wardrobe, who was henceforth their tenant.⁶ When keeper Cook handed over the office to his successor Retford, on January 31, 1349, the king's houses and *hospicium* between Lombard Street and Cornhill headed the list of goods and property transferred.⁷ There also seems to have been a foothold for the office at Westminster, and in October 1351 it still had a corner in the Tower.⁸

¹ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/37. Account for repairs to houses of the great wardrobe in Lombard Street, ordered by privy seal, dated July 25, 1343. The total cost was £5: 3: 2. Some of the materials were provided by John Flete "custos armaturarum regis infra turrin London."

² *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 94.

³ *E.A.* 389/14: "Pro vadiis unius clerici et unius valetti morancium apud London, super custodia magne garderobe et faciencium in eadem liberaciones diuersas."

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 147 (Aug. 6, 1348); *Foedera*, iii. 167: "hospicium nostrum magnum in strata de Lombardestrete situm."

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1348-50, p. 146. Cross had been chamberlain of the exchequer since 1347; *ib.*, 1345-48, p. 265.

⁶ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/45d (Mich. 1347 to Mich. 1348): "Et in solucionem capellanis deseruientibus in capella sancti Stephani infra palacium Westmonasterii de redditu predictarum domorum garderobe regis predictae capelle debito pro tempore quo idem custos morabatur in iisdem domibus, c.s."

⁷ *E.A.* 391/15: "domos et hospicium regis . . . in ciuitate London' inter Lumbardessstrete et Cornhill."

⁸ *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 324.

The Lombard Street house was still in use in the days of keeper Buckingham,¹ and early in 1353 his successor, Robert Wingerworth, was granted it *pro officio suo*.² The great wardrobe remained in possession until October 1, 1361, though the premises were so dilapidated that they were in constant need of extensive repairs.³ A worse annoyance than this must, however, have been the persistence with which William de la Pole continued to urge his claims upon the property. In 1360 these were recognised, and soon the great wardrobe quitted Lombard Street for ever. The Poles then stepped into the full enjoyment of the whole of the Lombard Street estate and long maintained it as their chief town house,⁴ but it was forfeited to the crown on the fall of Michael de la Pole, earl of Suffolk, in 1388.⁵

Between November 1, 1360, and February 28, 1362, the great wardrobe found temporary accommodation by the churchyard of St. Michael's, Cheapside, in a tenement which had once belonged to the monks of Abingdon.⁶ But search for more suitable premises was instituted and was soon rewarded. Three centuries of quiet occupation of the dwelling procured stood in strong contrast to the precarious and broken possession of Lombard Street. This permanent home was situated in the extreme south-west of the city within the walls, to the north of Baynard's castle, to the east of the great convent of the Black Friars, and not far north of Puddle Wharf, which gave it access to the river. There, in the parish of St. Andrew's by Baynard's castle, just north of the church, Sir John Beauchamp, younger son of Guy

¹ *Ib.* p. 456; cf. *E.A.* 392/4: "pro portagio pannorum de diuersis shopis mercatorum ubi emebantur usque hospicium magne garderober in Lumbard Strete."

² *Ib.* 391/12, f. 3.

³ Nearly every great wardrobe account contains items for the repairs of this house. Buckingham spent £19:6:7 on repairing its defects in 1350-53; *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/48; and other repairs were ordered in May 1359; *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 564. Compare *E.A.* 393/11, f. 63. The patching continued through 1359 (*C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 564) and until the summer of 1361; *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/4. There was also a rent charge on the property, created by the Poles in favour of the nuns of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, which the crown now had to pay; *ib.* Cf. *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 456.

⁴ Stow, *Survey of London*, i. 293.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1388-92, pp. 190-191.

⁶ *Enr. Ac. (W. and H.)*, 4/8, records this in the form of a belated payment made, in 1362-63, by keeper Snaith, to the parson and parishioners of St. Michael's for a tenement, "quod pro officio magne garderober extitit deputatum et occupatum." It looks as if Lombard Street were still used partially until Oct. 1, 1361. See below, p. 406, n. 3.

and brother of Thomas, earl of Warwick, and himself governor of Calais and a hero of Edward's French wars, had built on his own land a spacious town house, with adjacent shops and houses giving on to a small square. He died in 1360¹ and his executors sold the whole site, mansion, shops, houses and square to the king, who resolved to transfer to these roomy quarters the office of the great wardrobe.² There was delay while the buildings were adapted to the needs of their new tenants, but on October 1, 1361, the removal of the office was completed.³

There were still some minor difficulties to be faced. In particular, William Everdon, parson of the parish, complained bitterly of the loss of dues and offerings which resulted from the conversion of a knight's mansion, filled with followers and soldiers, into a government office and store, guarded, at times, only by a clerk and a yeoman. In the end, the disgruntled rector of St. Andrew's was placated by a pension of 40s. a year for life,⁴ and the adoption of the policy of letting the houses and shops to various tenants prevented the complete disappearance of parishioners from Beauchamp's old property.⁵

The ultimate establishment of the great wardrobe in a city home meant, for most practical purposes, the withdrawal of

¹ *Cal. Inq.* x. 493-495. Of six inquests, three date his death Dec. 2, two Dec. 10, and one says "date of death not known."

² By a curious coincidence some houses near Baynard's castle had already been owned by Roger the Tailor in the very early days of the great wardrobe; *C.R.* 84/7.

³ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/6. Payment to keeper Snaith for "portagium et carriagium diuersarum rerum in remocione officii magne garderober de Lumbardestrete usque hospiciū regis de Baynardescastell infra ciuitatem Londonie." The limits of this account are June 26, 1361-June 29, 1362. The date of the final transfer is fixed by *ib.* m. 8.

⁴ *Ib.* 4/8: "Willelmo de Euerdon, persone ecclesie Sancti Andree de Baynardescastell, Londoniis, in recompensacionem decimarum, oblacionum, et aliarum subuencionum eidem ecclesie attingentium de tenementis per Johannem de Bello Campo, chivaler, infra parochiam ecclesie predictae adquisitis, et jam in manum regis existentibus et per ipsam garderoberam pro officio illo occupatis, videlicet a primo die Octobris, anno regis xxxvi°, usque ad xxix^m diem Junii proximum sequentem, scilicet juxta ratam xl solidorum per annum, per breue regis." Similar entries occur relating to Everdon and his successors to the end of our period.

⁵ *Ib.* m. 23. The accounts of 1371-72 include the rents "diuersarum mansionum et shopparum que fuerunt Iohannis de Bello Campo," and note that one house was empty because no one would rent it. See also *E.A.* 396/18 for the rents of these "houses and shops" which amounted to £9:17:6 in the previous year 1370-71.

the office "out of court."¹ From being part of the household it became a small self-contained government office. Yet even in the fifteenth century the fact that the great wardrobe had once belonged to the king's household was still vaguely remembered, as is shown by the curious document called the *Liber Niger Domus regis Edwardi IV.*, which has now been in print for considerably more than a century.² After treating of various officers of the household, the book goes on to consider the office and keeper of the great wardrobe, the "Wardrober, called by the noble King Edward the Third his statutes, clerk *purveyour du le garderobe de Roi*, that tyme beyng of the body of household, afterwards removed by King Richarde seconde, assigned to kepe his office continually in London among merchaunts and artificers, hymselfe to come when the King or Chaumberlayn calleth hym specially at the iiii festes of the yere, as an office of chaumbre outward."³ Like many other statements in this perplexing tract, this remark contains a curious mixture of truth and error. Although it is correct about two wardrobes being separated, it is demonstrably wrong when it says that the wardrober first "kept his office continually in London" in the reign of Richard II., if by that phrase is meant the permanent establishment in the city, hard by St. Andrew's church. We must remember, however, that for the whole of Edward III.'s time and for at least the first third of Richard's reign, the great wardrobe in the city was in charge of a clerk assigned for the purpose,⁴ and that it was improbable the keeper himself really lived up to his residential obligation. Although in the fourteenth century, as in a later age, the "wardrober's" official residence was the *hospicium* of the great wardrobe,⁵ it is not unlikely that it is to

¹ The keepers, however, continued to receive wages "juxta formam statuti hospicii regis"; *Exch. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/23.

² *Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Household*, Edward III. to William and Mary (Soc. Antiquaries, 1790), p. 36. The *Liber Niger* is printed on pp. 15-85, from *MS. Harl.* 642, ff. 1-196. What is the relation of this to the Tudor transcript in *M.B.E., T. of R.*, 230, and the book of orders in the household in *ib.* 206? ³ *Ib.* p. 37.

⁴ This arrangement continued until the days of Alan Stokes, whose accounts for 1385-87 include a charge for the wages of one clerk continually staying at London "super salua custodia ipsius garderobe"; *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 5/4. Compare, however, *C.C.R., 1377-81*, p. 29, which shows that John Sleaford had his lodging there in the later years of Edward III., and that Sleaford delivered it to Stokes in 1377. Perhaps the reference is only to a temporary absence of Stokes. ⁵ Stow, *Survey of London*, ii. 16.

the final step in the process of his isolation to which the Black Book refers.

However that may be, the Black Book of Edward IV. is of special interest in that it brings us back to the point from which we started. The mistake many modern scholars have made of confusing the great wardrobe with the wardrobe proper has at least the excuse of being a venerable one,¹ easily intelligible in light of the facts. Indeed, we must recognise that the threefold division of the king's wardrobe made by them, though inexact for the greater part of our period, became true towards the end of it. The error is, in fact, much older than this fifteenth century Black Book,² for as early as 1358 and 1359 official documents described well-known clerks or keepers of the great wardrobe as "clerks of the king's wardrobe."³ The confusion was aggravated when men began to speak of the wardrobe of the household simply as the "household," and even before that, it was not uncommon for its officers to be described shortly as treasurer, controller or cofferer of the household.⁴ With the wardrobe of the household identifying itself with the court, and the privy wardrobe at the same time degenerating into the armouries of the Tower, the great wardrobe came to be the only institution commonly termed a wardrobe.

To drop in common speech the distinctive adjective from the great wardrobe was only a short step farther. In the early part of Richard II.'s reign men began to call the great wardrobe simply the wardrobe,⁵ and by Tudor times only antiquaries knew

¹ See above, pp. 349-350.

² *Household Ordinance*, p. 19: "Our sovereyn lordes household is now discharged . . . of the wardrober, also called clerk purvayour besides the grete wardrober of household, which is the countyng house; and the household tresorer, called custos garderober hospicii." This is a striking illustration of the hopeless confusion between the two wardrobes.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, p. 15, calls William Dalton on Feb. 28, 1358, and *ib.* p. 35, calls John Newbury, on June 26, 1359, "clerk of the king's wardrobe" when they were officially giving information as to the duties of the pavilioner, one of their subordinates in the great wardrobe.

⁴ As early as 1366-67 Hugh Segrave is called "contrarotulator hospicii"; *E.A.* 392/2 E.

⁵ The phrase was adopted even in official writing before our period ends; for example, "apud garderobam suam in ciuitate Londonie," on June 14, 1381; *Foedera*, iv. 123; "donne souz nostre signet a nostre garderober dedeinz nostre citee de Loundres"; *C.W.* f. 1341, Feb. 6, 1384. Compare the description of Walter Ralphs in *I.R.* 1 Ric. II., Mich. t. m.9, as "nuper custos garderober regis."

that there had ever been other wardrobes. Beauchamp's old home in the city became "the wardrobe," or the "king's wardrobe in the city." Its parish church, formerly known as St. Andrew's by Baynard's castle, had, when Stow wrote, assumed its modern name of St. Andrew's by the Wardrobe.¹ A good historian, like Stow, knew that the place was really the king's great wardrobe, yet in connection with it he tells us that "secret letters . . . were wont to be enrolled in the king's wardrobe," though the great wardrobe had, of course, never been the place of such enrolment. A similar want of clarity made the keeper of the great wardrobe the "wardrober" or "the master of the wardrobe," with his lodging still in Beauchamp's house. The fact that in Stow's time a master of the wardrobe was also chancellor of the exchequer shows how far we have drifted away from the ancient distinctions. By this time a similar confusion led to the description of the cofferers of the household as keepers of the great wardrobe of the household. The office of keeper, or master, of the great wardrobe had become a lucrative position, held for life and given or sold to noblemen who sometimes secured its reversion for their heirs.²

Beauchamp's old mansion and grounds were so roomy that they could accommodate much more than the great wardrobe office. Repairs and improvements were constantly needed, but these were done effectively enough to make it possible to use the building and land for many purposes. The official residence of the keeper was there,³ and there was space to group round the central office some, at least, of the factories, where some of the articles in which it dealt were made. This side of great wardrobe work was encouraged to develop by such guarantee of security of tenancy. Walter Ralphs, the king's tailor, lived on the estate, just as his predecessor, Nicholas Wight, had had quarters in Lombard Street in the early days of Edward III.⁴

¹ Stow, *Survey of London*, ii. 15-16. The church, destroyed in the great fire, was rebuilt by Wren.

² *Hist. MSS. Com. Buccleuch MSS. in Montagu House*, i. 217, 352, 360, 383, 387, 520 illustrate various aspects of the later history of the great wardrobe.

³ See above, p. 407, n. 4, for Sleaford's quarters, which he kept until Dec. 13, 1377, when he vacated them in favour of Alan Stokes.

⁴ For Walter Ralphs' house, see above, pp. 384-385, n. 5. This house must have been of considerable pretensions, as it had been occupied by Sir Simon Burley

No doubt, Ralph made his lodging the *officium cissorie magne garderobe*, where two permanent *valetti* and other occasional helpers worked for the rest of Richard's reign.¹ Other houses and shops were let at a modest rent. The central premises were commodious enough to be used by the king for such business as occasional meetings of ministers or of the council.² They were, moreover, sufficiently strong to serve as a place of refuge for Richard II. at the worst time of the Peasants' Revolt, for on Friday, June 14, 1381, he went straight from his conference with the rebels at Mile End to the great wardrobe, where he remained, accompanied by his mother, until Sunday at least,³ giving there the great seal to two temporary keepers in succession.⁴ Nor was it a royal residence only in times of crisis, for in 1392-94 over £90 were spent in repairs and furnishings against the king's arrival.⁵ In 1398 it even served as the prison of Thomas Mowbray, the disgraced duke of Norfolk, and his retinue of twenty servants.⁶ In the fifteenth century, also, it often afforded shelter to kings and princes.⁷ The chief officer, then called master of the wardrobe, resided there until

from Easter, 1378 to 1380; *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 5/1. Its ordinary rent was 40s. a year, but Burley was allowed to live in it rent free. However, on July 5, 1379, Burley received a grant of a house in Thames Street, near at hand, the property of the alien abbot of Fécamp, then in the king's hands by reason of the schism; *C.P.R., 1377-81*, p. 371. He seems then to have quitted the wardrobe, for Ralph's immediate predecessor was Edward, a monk of Bury, whose death gave Ralph his chance of a home in the great wardrobe.

¹ *E.A.* 402/16, 403/5.

² *C.P.R., 1377-81*, p. 535, records a writ warranted by the king in his wardrobe in the presence of the chancellor, two bishops and the keeper of the privy seal.

³ Froissart, *Chron.* ix. 406, 409, ed. Kervyn, wrongly says that Richard "s'en vent en la garderobe la roine," "qui siet en la Reolle." He testifies to princess Joan's presence there; *ib.* p. 416.

⁴ *Ib.* iv. 123: "apud garderobam suam in civitate Londonie."

⁵ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 5/7. This was "contra adventum regis ibidem per diuersas vices infra predictum tempus."

⁶ *Foedera*, vii. 36 (Original Ed.); mandate of Apr. 23, 1398, to the Londoners "quod pro salua et secura custodia Thome, ducis Norfolcie, infra garderobam nostram infra ciuitatem predictam . . . circa garderobam nostram predictam tam per aquam quam per terram, per vigilias et alio modo, taliter ordinatas quod idem dux ab eadem garderoba nullatenus exeat." See also *C.C.R., 1396-99*, pp. 258, 259.

⁷ For example, for Richard III. on Nov. 9, 1485; for queen Elizabeth of York in 1487; for Arthur prince of Wales, before his marriage in 1500; *Chronicles of London*, pp. 192, 218, 234 (ed. Kingsford).

its destruction in 1666 by the Great Fire of London,¹ after which it was not rebuilt, and the office, shorn of all its importance, was moved outside the city first to Buckingham Street in the Savoy, and later to Great Queen Street. It was abolished in 1782 by Burke's act for Economical Reform.²

The great wardrobe was not so tied down to its house in the city that it could not move at all. Potentially it was still so far a member of the household that, if the king went on a distant expedition, it might be called upon to follow him, just as keeper Cross had followed Edward to Antwerp in 1338.³ But such departures from routine were infrequent, and were made chiefly in Richard II.'s reign, notably at the time of the Scottish campaign of 1385 and the two Irish expeditions of 1394-95 and 1399. On the Scottish journey, the whole of the manufacturing side of the great wardrobe accompanied the king, each departmental chief being attended by his assistants. There were Walter Ralphs with his two *valetti cissorie*, Hans, the embroiderer, with his two *valetti broudatores*, William Snell, the armourer, with two men-at-arms and six *valetti armatores*, and John Ward, the pavilioner, with ten *valetti pavillonarii*. With them went the keeper of the privy wardrobe of the Tower, also suitably supported by his underlings. An ordinance of the council had assigned to all these travelling expenses according to their station, the heads of departments and the men-at-arms 40s. each, and the yeomen and archers 20s. each, payable by the keeper of the great wardrobe.⁴

¹ For the position of the great wardrobe at this period see F. R. Harris, *Life of Edward Mountagu, first earl of Sandwich*, i. 242, 256-257; ii. 187. Sandwich was master of the wardrobe from 1661 to 1667. There are some interesting references to the "wardrobe" in the diary of Sandwich's cousin, Samuel Pepys. After the Restoration of 1660 there were still 800 workmen employed in the wardrobe. Its last master was Thomas, Lord Pelham, afterwards first earl of Chichester.

² 22 George III. Cap. LXXXII.

³ See above, pp. 396-397.

⁴ *Enr. Ac. (W. and H.)* 5/4: "Et Waltero Raufe, cissori regis cum duobus valettis cissoribus, Hans Broudario cum duobus valettis broudatoribus, Willelmo Snell, armatori, cum ij hominibus ad arma et vj valettis armatoribus, Johanni Wade pavillonario cum xv valettis pavillonariis, Ranulpho de Hatton, custode priuate garderobe regis infra turrim London. cum vno homine ad arma, et magistro canonum cum xj valettis et sagittariis, ordinatis per consilium regis ad proficiscendum cum rege ad partes Scocie, anno ix^o." The sum paid was £47, and a privy seal writ to the treasurer and barons, dated Nov. 6, 1388, directed them to allow Alan Stokes that sum.

In Edward III.'s reign other wardrobes, following the example of the king's great wardrobe, settled in the city. On December 22, 1330, the king granted queen Philippa, for life, his house in La Réole otherwise "The Royal" or "Tower Royal" in the parish of St. Michael's, Paternoster, to serve as her wardrobe.¹ In 1381, long after Philippa's death, this building was still called the queen's wardrobe, and was used as such by Anne of Bohemia,² though Joan of Navarre, queen of Henry IV., had her wardrobe in Aldersgate Street in the forfeited house of the Percys.³ There was also in the fourteenth century a wardrobe in the Old Jewry, appertaining to the duchy of Cornwall, which passed to the princess Joan after her husband's death.⁴ This was popularly called the prince's wardrobe.⁵ As early as 1353 there was even a king's wardrobe in Calais.⁶

In considering the staffing and the location of the great wardrobe we have been compelled to deal, incidentally, with some of the chief functions of the office. These may, for convenience, be grouped under five heads. The first was that of collection, the assembling, by the agency of purchasers, prisers and purveyors, of the various commodities for which it was responsible. The second was that of manufacture, the working up of raw materials, provided from various sources, but needing further treatment before they were ready for use, as for example the making of clothes from the cloth and furs received. The third was that of storage, both of raw and of manufactured goods. The fourth business was that of distribution, the delivery of the contents of its magazines and the product of its workshops, to the persons to whom the king ordered such delivery to be made. Fifthly and lastly, came that of accounting, the obligation of the office to account for all its actions and to render detailed testimony

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1330-34, p. 37. Compare Stow's *Survey*, i. 243-244; ii. 324.

² Stow, i. 71.

³ *Ib.* i. 309.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1374-77, p. 408.

⁵ *C.W.* f. 1346 (9 Ric. II.): "le houstiel appellee la princeswarderobe en laancien Jewerie dedeins nostre citee de Loundres."

⁶ *E.A.* 392/14. Rothwell's privy wardrobe accounts: "recepta de Hugone lengynour, custode garderobe domini regis infra villam Calesie, xxvi° die Julii, anno xxvii°." This was clearly a storehouse of arms and military apparatus, but it is not evident whether it was more closely affiliated to the great or to the privy wardrobe. It was normal for the keeper of the privy wardrobe to receive articles from the keeper of the great wardrobe.

of its considerable receipts and expenditure. The multifarious duties of the head of the great wardrobe explain his several titles : as *emptor et provisor* he collected his materials ; as *custos* he stored and, when necessary, manufactured them ; as *liberator* he delivered them to the consumer ; and as *clericus* he accounted for the transactions and finances of his department.

About the first three functions we have already said all that is necessary, but the last two have still to be considered. The process by which great wardrobe articles were distributed is abundantly illustrated by the files of miscellaneous documents preserved in the exchequer accounts as "documents subsidiary to the accounts of the great wardrobe." These innumerable short slips of parchment show vividly the working of the mechanism of this branch of fourteenth-century administration. A large number of them are letters of privy seal, in which the king authorised the keeper of the great wardrobe to release his wares. Thus, in 1305, Edward I. instructed Ralph Stokes to deliver a cloth of gold to bearer, or 9 lb. of wax to the chancellor, or a double set of robes to some Welsh archers, or to supply the household officers with cloth for their robes.¹ Similarly Edward, prince of Wales, sent letters under his privy seal, ordering four robes with fur linings.²

Many of the mandates were from the keeper of the wardrobe, directing the clerk of the great wardrobe to issue articles for the service of the court, pieces of wax, loaves of sugar, cloth, fruit, spices and so on. Such orders were authenticated by a small red seal, apparently that of the keeper, and belong to the class of warrants called "bills of the wardrobe." When the recipient of the goods was an individual, he generally gave the keeper of the great wardrobe a receipt, sealed with his personal seal. Many of these receipts are still preserved, each filed next to the corresponding warrant or order.

Of particular interest are the numerous receipts for robes, given by the king to those about to be made knights on some great festival.³ Such gifts were but one item of the unending

¹ *E.A.* 368/13.

² *Ib.* 370/10.

³ For instance, see in *E.A.* 383/5, a file of writs of privy seal, ordering keeper Ouseflect to deliver robes to new knights on the occasion of Edward III.'s coronation, and the corresponding receipts under the seals of the new knights, neatly attached to each writ. The form of the receipt ran : "Pateat uniuersis

round of presents and liveries, which the king lavished on his kinsfolk, servants and friends, from the resources of the great wardrobe. The customary *liberaciones robarum* to the king's enormous household, occurring half-yearly as regularly as the payment of wages, must have been a heavy burden.¹ Besides the members of the court, the judges of the benches and the barons of the exchequer received robes from this source.² There were also extraordinary presents to be made, enshrined with similar formalities, and liveries of wax, spice, cloth of gold and the rest.³

Did the king make his wife a present of a gown, an elaborate

per presentes quod ego, Hubaud, recepi de domino Thoma de Useflete, clerico magne garderobe domini regis, ad apparatus meum pro militia mea particulas subscriptas, videlicet de panno bruno," etc. We learn from these writs that the robes given to a banneret were more costly and elaborate than those given to a simple knight. Judges, when knighted, received the robes of a banneret, as early as 1332; *E.A.* 385/20, mandate to keeper Zouch to deliver "couenable apperail si come appertient a lestat de banneret, parceque ordinez est par nous et par nostre conseil qe nos bien amez William de Denum, Richard de Aldeburgh, John de Schardlawe et Thomas Bacoun seront noz justices et prendront de nous l'ordre de cheualer, le xxiiij jour de Feurier"; *i.e.* Feb. 23, 1332. Their appointments were as follows: Aldeburgh (Feb. 3) and Shardlaw (Jan. 28) as justices of the bench, Bacon (Jan. 28, 1332) and Denum (before Dec. 3, 1332) as justices "coram rege." It is interesting that the custom of dubbing as knights lay judges of the two benches, on or after their appointment, went back so far. As clerical judges gradually disappeared, it became the order of nature for all judges to be dubbed knights.

¹ See, for example, *E.A.* 385/4, an indenture between Garton, keeper of the wardrobe, and Zouch, keeper of the great wardrobe, "de nominibus familie et retente regis quibus liberacio robarum facta fuit pro seysona hiemali, anno regni quarto," by which robes were to be provided for 29 bannerets, 43 "milites," 57 "clerici," 6 "sub-clerici capelle," 113 "scutiferi," 23 "seruientes-ad-arma," 46 "seruientes officiorum," 6 falconers, 25 huntsmen, 20 minstrels, 77 valets of the offices, 3 washerwomen, 91 palfreymen of the king, and 11 of the earl of Cornwall, 37 sumpters of the king, 7 of the earl of Cornwall, 29 carters of the king and 1 of the earl of Cornwall, and 45 other people. The total number of persons receiving robes is 669. Compare *ib.* 367/17: "*liberaciones robarum regis filiorum et aliorum de familia sua facte per Radulphum de Stokes, clericum magne garderobe*" (33 Edw. I.).

² The French war, or the Black Death, made cloth and fur scarce and dear; *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, pp. 183, 459. Keeper Dalton seems, in consequence, to have given scanty supplies of cloth to the justices and barons; see in *ib.* p. 562 a mandate of Oct. 24, 1353, to Dalton to give judges and barons "as much cloth for robes as befits their estate," as the livery to them has been so short "that they cannot properly be clothed therewith." For the same reason the keeper of the hanaper was directed to make additional allowances to the chancellor for the robes of the clerks of the chancery; *ib.* p. 459. Until 1370, the prior of St. John's Hospital gave the ministers of the exchequer caps, but at that date he was discharged from his obligation on payment of a fine; *C.P.R.*, 1367-70, p. 456.

³ *E.A.* 382/2 and 367/18.

series of writs and indentures had to be drafted.¹ No livery was complete until an indenture had been drawn up between the keeper of the wardrobe and the keeper of the great wardrobe, testifying the names of the recipients and the amount of robes provided for each.² When the transactions were completed, a general list was compiled by the keeper of the great wardrobe, and forwarded to the wardrobe or to the exchequer.³ A counter-roll of the transactions was also drawn up⁴ by the controller and similarly despatched. The cost of carriage from the great wardrobe office to the places where the king held his court and had need of the goods is also regularly recorded in the great wardrobe accounts.⁵

An important part of the great wardrobe liveries was the delivery of material from it to the other wardrobe departments. The privy wardrobe of the Tower, for example, received from the great wardrobe much of its supplies. Thus, we find keeper Cross accounting for bows and crossbows, but forthwith transferring them to Fleet at the Tower.⁶ In the same way keeper Cook handed to Mildenhall, keeper of the Tower wardrobe, thread, worsted, hemp, linen and tanned hides, for the repair of the king's tents, harness and saddlery. Cook also dispatched large quantities of woollen cloth to the privy wardrobe and chamber for *quedam secreta cameram regis tangencia*, and canvas for packing bows and arrows sent to Flanders. Among his provisions of "wax and spices" were included supplies of sulphur and saltpetre, the more expensive elements of gunpowder, needed for the king's guns in the Crécy and Calais campaign.⁷ We may suspect, too, that some of the copper, brass and latten, purchased by

¹ For example, see *ib.* 393/2, an order of Edward III., dated Mar. 22, 1367, to H. de Snaith, keeper of the great wardrobe, to deliver a gown as a present to queen Philippa: "Nous volons et vous mandons qe vous aillez, ou enuoiez aucune persone couenable de qi vous fiez, deuers nostre trescher compaignie le roine pur lui demander de nostre part quele menere de goune lui plerra a auoir, de quel drap et queu colour; et auteile goune come le vorra auoir, facez faire et fururer par manere come elle vorra deuiser, et meisme la goune ensi fururee liuerer au garderober nostre dit compaignie . . . de nostre doun, fesant endenture parentre vous et le dit garderober, tesmoignante en toutes choses expressement la liueree quele vous lui ensi ferrez." There was an order for cloth for Alice Perrers on Mar. 27.

² For instance, *ib.* 376/22.

³ For instance, *E.A.* 377/10.

⁴ For instance, *ib.* 351/17.

⁵ For example, *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/37: "carriagia de eisdem domibus ad diuersa loca ubi rex morabatur."

⁶ *ib.* m. 33.

⁷ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/44d, 4/5, 45d, 46 and 47d.

Cook, was destined to be worked up in making the king's guns or other "artillery," and that some of the lead which Buckingham received from Retford in 1350 was used for making bullets.¹ In this way the great wardrobe played a part in the early history of fire-arms in this country, if only as a purchasing and distributing agent. But such entries do not seem to recur in later rolls, so that it soon resigned its obligations in this connection. The complex relations existing between the three offices of great wardrobe, chamber, and privy wardrobe, which bewilder the modern historian, were gradually simplified as the differentiation of wardrobe functions became more complete.

The history of the fifth, the accounting function of the great wardrobe, of its receipts and expenses, of its accountancy, and of its financial position generally, is cleft by the developments of 1324. Up to that year the great wardrobe was simply a department of the king's wardrobe, financed mainly through the wardrobe, and accountable to the keeper of the wardrobe, who summarised, in one of the *tituli* of his own account, such portions of the great wardrobe clerk's statement as he deemed relevant. What the keeper recorded with unfailing regularity were the *empciones*, the sums he advanced to the clerk of the great wardrobe for the purchase of cloth and other like commodities. We have good reason to know that these sums were not all the income the great wardrobe enjoyed, for, even in the earliest years of which we have evidence, direct contributions from the exchequer and assignments from various sources of revenue flowed straight into its coffers.² Unluckily, we are more in the dark as to the methods the great wardrobe employed in spending its money. There are extant, however, to help occasionally to fill up gaps, some of the original great wardrobe "particulars" submitted by the clerk of the great wardrobe to the keeper of the wardrobe, and doubtless deposited by him in the exchequer, at the time of his account, along with the other vouchers by means of which he substantiated his figures. Although our information about great wardrobe finance is fragmentary for the reign of Henry III., it is much less so for that of Edward I. For the greater part of his reign a rough idea of the receipts of the great wardrobe can be gathered from the pipe roll summary enrolments of the ward-

¹ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* m. 49; cf. *ib.* m. 50d. ² See later, pp. 424-426.

robe accounts. These are fairly continuous, and sometimes exist in duplicate for the early and the middle years of the reign, but they fail us almost altogether for the last fifteen years. They are authoritative as to the sums paid by the wardrobe to the great wardrobe, and only less so as to the amounts disbursed on purchases by the great wardrobe staff. Their weak point is, of course, that they necessarily ignore all payments to the great wardrobe from other sources. To a limited, but important, extent, they are supplemented by some of the original great wardrobe documents just mentioned. Under Edward II. the sources are defective until towards the end of the reign, when the great wardrobe first tendered its accounts directly to the exchequer, in obedience to the ordinance of 1324, which also provided that all great wardrobe revenue should come, exclusively and immediately, from the exchequer. From that point there is full evidence, except for certain periods in the reigns of both Edward III. and Richard, when great wardrobe accounts do not happen to have been preserved, either in enrolments or in original particulars.¹

Our earliest knowledge of great wardrobe finance comes, not from the wardrobe accounts, but from a schedule attached to a close roll, ten years later in date than the period to which the figures refer. From this we learn that, on the eve of the Barons' Wars, between September 29, 1257, and July 7, 1258, when Peter of Rivaux was still keeper of the main wardrobe, the sum of £1164 : 7 : 3 was paid out by him to the buyers, Richard of Ewell and Hugh of the Tower. This, however, did not cover their expenditure for the same period, since it amounted to £1936 : 10 : 7½. Ten years later this difference was still owing to the merchants.² Between July 8, 1258, and July 12, 1261,

¹ September 1351–November 1360, and September 1387–November 1390, a summary of known receipts and expenses of the great wardrobe will be included in the appendices in vol. v.

² *C.R.* 85, 52 Hen. III., a slip sewn on to m. 11 : "Excellentissimo domino suo, Henrico, Dei gracia illustri regi Anglie . . . deuoti sui, Thomas thesaurarius et ceteri barones de scaccario, salutem et fidele semper seruicium. Mandauit nobis vestra serenitas quod, facto visu de omnibus receptis et empcionibus factis ad opus vestrum et liberatis in garderoba vestra, de tempore quo Petrus de Riualis fuit custos eiusdem garderobe, scilicet de annis regni vestri xli° et xlii°, secundum particulas testificatas et liberatas ad scaccarium vestrum per Albericum de Fiscampo et Petrum de Wintonia, super quo sciat vestra dominacio quod, facto visu predicto de receptis et empcionibus predictis a festo Sancti

the keepers of the wardrobe accredited the sum of £6428 : 0 : 5½ to the same *emptores*, Richard of Ewell and Hugh of the Tower, and others, for their purchases.¹

A comparison of the two sets of figures makes the expenses of the great wardrobe work out at nearly £2000 for the nine months preceding the Provisions of Oxford, and at about £2000 a year for each of the three following years. Clearly, as far as the great wardrobe was concerned, the baronial government hardly brought about as great a reduction in expenditure as might have been anticipated, but the king's household was the last branch of the administration to have its spending cut down by the axe of reform. The next available figures cover the more revolutionary period from January to August 1265. For these eight months the great wardrobe expenses amounted to only £483 : 10 : 2½.² It is plain then, that during Simon de Montfort's ascendancy, after the battle of Lewes, the most rigid economy was enforced on the half-captive king. Unluckily, we have no more figures for the rest of his reign.

Michaelis, anno regni vestri xli^o, usque ad diem dominicam in festo Translacionis beati Thome martiris, anno regni vestri xlii^o, inuenitur quod Ricardus de Ewelle et Hugo de Turri, emptores garderobe vestre, receperunt de eadem garderoba per predictum tempus, mclxiiij*li*. vijs. iij*d*.; et quod positi fuerunt in empcionibus predictis per idem tempus, videlicet in pannis ad aurum et pannis de Aresta et serico, scarletis et allis pannis de diuersis coloribus, pelluris cendallis et aliis necessariis, ad predictam garderobam per predictos Ricardum et Hugonem, mdcccxxxvi*li*. xs. vijd. ob. Et sic habent de superplusagio dclxxij*li*. iijs. iiij*d*. ob., quod totum debetur adhuc mercatoribus, ut dicunt . . . valeat excellentia vestra diu." The treasurer who wrote this letter was Thomas of Wymondham; "de Aresta" seems to mean "of Arras."

¹ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 1/1d: "Et pro pannis, pelluris, cendallis, cera, speciebus et aliis necessariis emptis ad opus regis et regine, per manus Ricardi de Ewelle et Hugonis de Turre, per predictum tempus, mmmdecccxxvi*li*. xvijs. xd. ob. Item cxij*li*. ijs. vd., preter consimiles empciones emptas ex alia parte rotuli mmd*li*. ijs. vijd." In what is almost a duplicate, or rather a revised version, of the same account, on *ib.* m. 2, particulars are given of the source of the buyers' receipts up to the amount of £3721 : 13 : 3½. There is still another version in the same account which does not perfectly tally with these figures, though the discrepancy is not great. It runs as follows: "Et in pannis ad aurum, pannis de Aresta, et de serico, scarletis et aliis pannis de diuersis coloribus, peluris, cendallis, cera, speciariis, mappis, tuallii, lineâ tela, Kaneuasio, et aliis necessariis ad predictam garderobam per Ricardum de Ewelle et Hugonem de Turre emptores, sicut continetur in quodam rotulo de eisdem empcionibus quem liberauerunt in thesauro, vj mill. ccc xx*li*. xiijs. et ijd. Et habent de superplusagio cl*li*. viijs. quod totum debetur mercatoribus per diuersa breuia sua de liberate que sunt ad scaccarium"; *ib.* m. 2. See later, p. 425, n. 2.

² *Pipe*, 114/19d, 54 H. III.

The one period for which coherent great wardrobe "particulars" survive covers the critical years in which the scheme of great wardrobe operations, outlined in the ordinance of 1279, was getting into working order. For some of the purchases of Adenettus before the issue of that ordinance we still have "minute particulars," beginning in 1274 and going on to 1280.¹ But much more important are the "particulars," the actual accounts, of the clerks of the great wardrobe, which tell, in some detail, the story of the operations of the office between 1285 and 1290. The first is Hamo de la Legh's account for the period November 20, 1285–August 10, 1287,² which is supplemented by a counter roll, doubtless the work of Adenettus, Hamo's controller for part of the time, namely, November 20, 1285–November 20, 1286.³ Next come the accounts of Hamo's successor, Roger de Lisle, for August 10, 1287–November 20, 1288, and for November 20, 1288–November 20, 1289.⁴

From these we learn that a rigid and clear-cut system was imposed upon the great wardrobe by vigilant wardrobe keepers like Louth and Langton.⁵ To such control, as well as to the limited demands made upon the great wardrobe by a king sojourning mainly in Gascony, we may attribute the extreme moderation of the great wardrobe figures for these years. For the other years, however, much is uncertain. Any table of great wardrobe receipts and expenses under Edward I. must, apart from those few years, be highly conjectural. It is impossible to regard our totals at any time as more than approximations, for when comparison between the figures submitted to the exchequer by keepers of the wardrobe and those supplied by the clerks of the great wardrobe is possible, the two groups rarely give identical results. One fact, however, they do prove, namely, that

¹ *Chanc. Misc.* 3/11.

² *E.A.* 352/3.

³ *Ib.* 352/1: "unde idem Hamo et Adenettus sunt reddituri compotum in garderoba."

⁴ *Ib.* 352/10. Roger's fixed salary is thus recorded. "Et eidem Rogero, percipienti annuatim de garderoba regis viginti libras *per nouam ordinacionem* hospicii pro dicto officio faciendo pro feodo suo anni presentis, *xxli.*"

⁵ Thus in *ib.* 352/10 we can illustrate W. Langton's supervision by the remark: "Et sic restat quod dictus Rogerus (de Insula) debet de claro, allocacionibus sibi omnibus allocandis, de *iiij^{xx} xixli ixd.* unde respondebit, et in quibus tenetur regi de claro debito soluendo. Et dominus Walterus de Langeton, successor magistri Willelmi (de Luda) predicti, noluit se de dicto debito onerare."

the pipe roll figures do not embrace the whole great wardrobe revenue, for, with one exception only, the total receipts in the original great wardrobe accounts are higher than the advances from wardrobe to great wardrobe recorded in the pipe rolls. Yet enough instruction may be obtained from them to justify the trouble involved in tabulating the totals, and some striking agreements in detail are well worth consideration.¹

After 1316, and still more after 1323, comparatively satisfactory figures are available. The exchequer enrolments of the great wardrobe accounts enable us to ascertain the finances of the great wardrobe for the last years of Edward II. and for the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II., excepting only the years 1351–1360 and 1387–90. Many of the more detailed great wardrobe statements have also been preserved among the exchequer accounts. Comparison between the two classes shows that, while slight discrepancies are not uncommon, there seem none of any moment.²

We have seen that, under Henry III., the great wardrobe

¹ A few instances may here be collected. The receipts of the great wardrobe in 14 Edw. I. (Nov. 20, 1285–Nov. 20, 1286) were £6526:10:2; (*Pipe*, 136/31). This sum is confirmed to a penny, as the gross sum of the “liberaciones de magna garderoba regis,” in a “contrarotulus de diuersis liberacionibus” of the wardrobe in *E.A.* 352/2. (Of this sum, £1756:1:8 were liveries for robes; *ib.* 351/25 and 26). Nevertheless, in Hamo de la Legh’s own account, his gross receipt for the period Nov. 20, 1285–Aug. 10, 1287, was £9446:9:10, while his issues are £8600:3:0; *ib.* 352/3. We must note the difference of the dates which the two accounts cover, that of Legh including not only all 14 Edw. I., but more than eight months of 15 Edw. I. It would be more useful, then, if we compare his figures with the pipe roll totals for the two years combined. As the receipt for 15 Edw. I., according to the pipe roll, is only £2101:9s. (*Pipe*, 136/31d), the pipe roll totals for the two years, Nov. 20, 1285–Nov. 20, 1287, only amounted to £8627:19:2, which is roughly £800 less than what Legh himself recorded he had received in a period three months shorter. However, for the figures of 16 Edw. I. the pipe roll gives us £2622:18s., and *E.A.* 352/10 records them as £2661:18:2 (excluding the remnant). Here the substantial agreement makes the earlier discrepancy the more unintelligible. Nevertheless, the pipe roll figures are declared to be those “de quibus H. de la Legh et Adenettus reddiderunt computum in eadem garderoba.” Other comparative figures are: *Pipe*, 134, 17 Edw. I., £4340:7:8; *E.A.* 352/10, £3519:16:1½, including remnant; *Pipe*, 135, 8 Edw. I., £8038:16:10; *E.A.* 352/10 and 12, £11,514:19:9½. The seventeenth year of Edward I. was then the one year in which the original great wardrobe total was not so high as was the corresponding enrolment.

² For instance, Ousefleet’s account, in *E.A.* 383/2, makes his receipts total £4499:10:3. The exchequer enrolment gives the total as £4504:10:3. Arithmetical mistakes could easily account for the small difference. Considering the difficulties of adding up mediaeval figures, the clerks were competent arithmeticians.

turnover may be considered as less than £2000 a year. Under Edward I. the average annual great wardrobe receipts amounted to nearly £4000, but in the confused period at the end of Edward II.'s reign they sank below £1000. Apart from that one drop, great wardrobe receipts exhibited a steady growth throughout our period. For Edward III. the yearly average receipt was something like £4950, a figure the more valuable since, while preceding averages are based upon very imperfect evidence, this is based on the recorded accounts of forty-one out of the fifty-one years of Edward's reign. A study of the accounts for nineteen of the twenty-three years of Richard II. reveals that great wardrobe receipts averaged over £5800 per annum, an increase of about £850 on the figures of Richard's grandfather.¹ The actual increase in the latter half of the fourteenth century is, in fact, greater, because the receipts of the privy wardrobe, as we shall see, were accounted for separately during this period.

The figures of the great wardrobe accounts of Edward I. exhibit more uniformity than those of his successors' accounts, and we can almost guess why they rose and fell. Heavy coronation charges, covering vast expenditure on dresses, decorations and jewels, and lavish liveries of robes to courtiers and new knights, always taxed severely the resources of the great wardrobe in this and in subsequent reigns. Edward I.'s coronation expenses, more than £4000, were only accounted for in 1278-79, nearly five years after they had been incurred.² When he was preparing for a campaign, or for a long journey beyond sea, his great wardrobe expenses increased automatically. For instance, they ran up to the exceptionally high sum of £6500 for the year November 1285-November 1286, just before Edward left for a visit to the continent lasting from 1286 to 1289.³ Contrariwise, the absence of the court from England in those years reduced the great wardrobe receipts to little more than £2000 a year, the rate obtaining during

¹ The irregularity of the Richard II. figures make the average more misleading than instructive. See later, pp. 423-424.

² *Pipe*, 124/24d: "Egidio de Audenarde et Admetto, cissori regis, emptoribus magne garderobe, in diuersis apparatibus emptis ad coronacionem regis et regine, mmm,cclij*li*. xvijs. viij*d*." This amount is entered separately from the sum of £3252:12:5½, advanced by keeper Bek to the two buyers as their ordinary revenue of the year.

³ See for these figures and also those mentioned later in this paragraph, n. 1, p. 420, above.

the barons' wars. This may possibly mean that certain liabilities were postponed until the king's return, or that English obligations were defrayed from the exchequer or even from Gascon sources. Whatever the explanation, immediately after Edward had come back, the great wardrobe, in November 1289–November 1290, accounted for a sum variously estimated as over £8000 and over £10,000. Either total would be by far the largest of the reign.¹

As to Edward II.'s reign, we can only speak with authority for the years 1323–27, after the great wardrobe had begun to tender its accounts to the exchequer. For the whole of this short period the sums at the disposal of the great wardrobe were extraordinarily small, never rising higher than £983, and once sinking to £779. Yet the year of the smallest receipt was the one in which the expense touched an even lower level, leaving a balance in favour of the exchequer, the only one of the five years of which that can be said.

The remarkable fluctuations of the great wardrobe receipts under Edward III. are hard to explain. There are totals exceeding £10,000 for the periods January 1333–August 1334, February 1350–September 1351, and June 29, 1366–September 29, 1367. The weddings of the king's children, royal funerals,² great festivities, pompous ceremonies and warlike preparations may account for the heavier amounts of some of the totals. In the early part of the reign, when the wardrobes bore the lion's share of all war budgets, military expenses were doubtless largely responsible for the inflated receipts of the great wardrobe. Thus for the years 1331–37, the great wardrobe's annual average receipt was rather more than £6600. The Scottish war clearly absorbed most of this, because, for the greater part of the period, the great wardrobe was in the north, in order to be near the seat of hostilities. On the other hand, immediately afterwards, when

¹ We have, unluckily, no certain figures for 34 Edw. I., or it would have been interesting to know the cost of the liveries consequential on the knighting of Edward of Carnarvon at Whitsuntide, 1306. See, however, *E.A.* 362/20, 369/4. Three hundred esquires were knighted with the prince of Wales, "ipso domino rege sumptuum necessaria de garderoba sua singulis ministrante"; *Chron. de Melsa*, ii. 277. The confusion between wardrobe and great wardrobe in the Yorkshire chronicle shows how indistinct was the division of the wardrobe into departments at this date.

² In 1328 Ousefleet was specially appointed by the king and council to provide for the expenses of the funeral of Edward II.; *I.R.* 232/9 Mich. t. 2 E. III.

the great wardrobe was in Brabant, the totals were low, the average for 1337-41 being but a few pounds over £3000, notwithstanding that at no other period did the war budget claim so large a proportion of wardrobe expenses as in those costly years of the Netherlandish campaigns.

Later on, when the wardrobes were withdrawing from participation in war finance, years of military activity were often, naturally, times of low receipt totals. Thus the Crécy-Calais campaigns did not prevent the total of the year and three quarters between December 1345 and Michaelmas 1347 sinking to the modest sum of £4871.¹ That was the lowest great wardrobe receipt of the reign up to then. Yet wardrobe receipts soon rose again, totalling, for nearly two whole years, in 1350-51, over £11,833. Although war expenses were no longer an item, most of the totals of the years during which the treaty of Calais was in force were exceedingly high. Early in this period the exchequer, when drawing up an estimate of the normal revenue in times of peace, assigned £4000 a year to the great wardrobe and its liveries.² Yet, after the war was renewed, we get such minute receipts as £401 for 1372 and £605 for 1373. Edward III. was then living in retirement, and court lavishness, not military equipment, seems the chief cause of a high great wardrobe receipt. The expenses of these years, though low, were not far short of the normal £4000 estimate of 1362-63: but the receipt was now only a quarter of this estimate.

Under Richard II. the causes of the fluctuations are not easily discernible. The receipt was on a moderate scale for the first ten years, averaging little more than £3100 per annum, being low for the first four years and exceedingly low for the first two. Then the average soared, doubtless because of the king's marriage and the gradual elaboration of his state as he grew older. There are, as we have learnt, no accounts for the critical years of struggle, 1387-90, and when they reappear

¹ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/44, 45. Between Dec. 1345 and Sept. 1346 it was only £1733. The king beyond seas had little use for a great wardrobe in England. The expenses were higher than the receipts during the period of preparation, but the receipt was higher than the expense when the king went abroad.

² *E.H.R.* xxxix. 417. But the summary of expenses incurred in the three years 1359-63 states that the great wardrobe expenses for that period were £15,222; *ib.* p. 418.

for November 1390–Michaelmas 1392, the figures they yield are rather lower than those we have for before 1387. After 1392 the receipts attain a much higher level, being over £7000 per annum in 1392–94 and over £14,000 from Michaelmas 1394 to Easter 1398. The following six months showed an extreme reduction in receipt, but the expenses were not far below the earlier averages, and were doubtless met by the favourable balance of the previous term. The last year of the reign also involved a receipt of over £14,000, so that we may consider this sum the average for the years after 1392. Obviously one result of Richard's making himself a despot was the marked swelling of the great wardrobe receipt. His inordinate love of luxury, especially in dress and handsome gifts, freely indulged, only accounts for part of this. The great wardrobe was, in fact, charged with much of the cost of equipping the two expeditions to Ireland, and was saddled with some of the expense of the enlarged household army. In addition the office went out of England with the king.

Generalisations must be made with care, and due attention paid to the expenses of the great wardrobe as well as to its receipts. Expenses of the great wardrobe were not always on the same level as its income. Some of the years in which Edward III. was too embarrassed to put much money into the great wardrobe coffers were years in which its expenditure was heavier than the revenue, as for instance in 1332, when the expenses of £8180 were £1000 in excess of the receipts, and again in 1337–38, and in 1339–41. Yet from August 1334 to April 1335, receipts and expenses balanced to within £20. When the wardrobe had overspent its resources it was not unusual for the income for the succeeding periods to be so increased that the consequent surplus over expenses in the long run counterbalanced previous unthriftiness. For example, in 1336–37 the receipt of £8562 was more than £500 greater than the expenses of £7996. This policy therefore produced more or less equilibrium between receipts and issues over long periods.

The provenance of the great wardrobe revenue next demands our attention. Even in the earliest period, when the great wardrobe was strictly a department of the wardrobe, much of the money was received directly, though theoretically it was

regarded as paid to the wardrobe. Peter of Rivaux kept the buyers of the great wardrobe so securely bridled that their only resource, if they overspent the sums he advanced them, was to owe their deficit to the merchants concerned. But immediately afterwards, the reforms of the Provisions of Oxford seem to have given the buyers the alternative of direct application to the exchequer. Full advantage was at once taken of this freedom, and of the £6400 or £6300 which, as we have seen, they spent between June 1258 and July 1261,¹ nearly half was not handled by the wardrobe itself at all. In one of the two versions of the account, the buyers' receipts, up to the amount of £3721 : 12 : 2½, went to them from other sources than the wardrobe. A sum of nearly £1529 was paid from the exchequer on the authority of various writs of *liberate* from the chancery.² A still larger sum was paid from the issues of the bishopric of Winchester, which for two years had been in the king's hands. The remaining direct receipts included small sums from the fermes of various towns, shires and manors, from several local escheators, and also from the sale of some scarlet cloth apparently not wanted for the king's use.³ The considerable divergence between these earmarked receipts and the total receipts, which amounted to just over £2600, can be explained as exactly corresponding to the proportion of the great wardrobe income received by the two buyers from the hands of the keeper of the wardrobe. This

¹ See above, pp. 417-418 and notes.

² "Et de mldxxviii*li.* xvjs. vjd. et ob. quos . . . emptores eiusdem garderobe receperunt de eodem thesaurario"; *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 1/2.

³ *Ib.* 1/2. The details of this receipt are perhaps worth tabulating:

£1529	16	6½	from treasurer and chamberlains of exchequer.
1680	7	6	from Nicholas de Hallou from the issues of the bishopric of Winchester, 43 and 44 Hen. III.
80	13	4	from ferm of the town of Lincoln.
50	0	0	from ferm of Grimsby.
40	0	0	from escheator of Lindsey.
40	0	0	from escheator of Kesteven.
60	0	0	from sheriff of Norfolk.
157	2	10	from sheriff of Lincolnshire.
60	0	0	from sheriff of Cambridgeshire.
23	12	0	from sale of three scarlet cloths.

£3721 12 2½ total.

Of course the sum from the exchequer was in addition to the amounts paid from the exchequer through the intermediary of the keeper of the wardrobe.

domestic, as opposed to foreign income of the great wardrobe, came ultimately, but only indirectly, from the exchequer.

Under Edward I., although details of great wardrobe receipts are not abundant, the main source of supplies seems to have been the wardrobe. Sometimes it was otherwise, as in the period October 18, 1274–November 20, 1275, when Giles of Oudenarde was credited with £3008 : 6 : 7 for which the wardrobe was answerable, although a mere trifle in ready money passed from the one department to the other. Luke of Lucca and his comrades advanced, directly to Giles, loans amounting to £2967 : 9 : 7,¹ and the transaction was recorded in the wardrobe account because, one imagines, the keeper of the wardrobe, and not his subordinate, was responsible for it. The circumstances were, however, exceptional, for Edward was only just back in England and his finances were not yet reduced to order.

Normality is better represented by the statement of Roger de Lisle, who, in his accounts for August 10, 1287, to August 19, 1288, claimed that, during this time, he had received in cash from the wardrobe, the sum of £2661 : 18 : 2. His total receipt was only £3015, and the difference between the two sums consisted entirely of the “remnant” left in the great wardrobe by Hamo de la Legh, his predecessor.² Similarly the large sum of £4391 : 19 : 4½, which the wardrobe advanced, in 28 Edw. I., to Ralph Stokes for his purchases,³ nearly approached the whole of his receipt.

In the latter part of Edward II.'s reign the great wardrobe could probably go for its income either to the wardrobe or directly to the exchequer. Then, in the exchequer ordinance of 1324 it was expressly laid down that the clerk of the great wardrobe should receive at the exchequer “all moneys with which he shall make purveyence.”⁴ It is disappointing to find that in the

¹ *Pipe*, 119/22. Luke made the advance “ad expensas magne garderobe per manus Egidii.”

² *E.A.* 352/10 “Per quod tempus computat se recipisse de garderoba eiusdem regis in pecunia numerata, mmdelxili. xvijjs. ijd., et de diuersis remanentibus exeuntibus in dicta magna garderoba post recessum Hamonis de Legh, predecessoris dicti Rogeri, extra Vasconiam, ccclijli. xvijs. Summa totalis recepte, mmmxvli. xvs. ijd.” Compare *ib.* 352/1 for the year Nov. 1285–Nov. 1286. *E.A.* 352/10 also makes the great wardrobe receipt for 1288–89 consist entirely of what came from Louth plus the balance of the last account, and similarly for 1289–90.

³ *L.Q.G.* pp. 354–355.

⁴ *R.B.E.* p. 910.

next reign this law was not strictly enforced, and that the method of financing the great wardrobe in the days of Richard of Ewell, and Hugh of the Tower, was still partially followed. For example, in 1 Edward III. Ousefleet's receipt came, not only from the exchequer, but also from the collectors of the customs, and to a small extent from other sources.¹ In 2 Edward III. Ousefleet's total receipt of £4960 was mostly derived directly from the exchequer, but he also received £1200 : 1 : 8 from Richard of Bury, the keeper of the wardrobe, *super diuersis providentiis officium magne garderobe tangentibus*.² In 3 Edward III. keeper Zouch's total receipt of £2871 can be split up into *recepta de scaccario* amounting to £1470 : 2 : 6, and "foreign receipt," which mainly came from Richard of Bury, still keeper of the wardrobe.³ Similarly, in 16 Edward III., Cross' receipts of £3870 comprised *recepta ad scaccarium* of £1762 : 4 : 4½ and *recepta forinseca* of £2108 : 13 : 10½, the latter including sums from the king's receivers of wool.⁴ When the great wardrobe receipt was particularly large, the excess above the average generally came from the exchequer. For instance, Cross' receipts from September 29, 1343, to August 2, 1344, exceeded £7568, of which £6333 : 10 : 6½ was paid by the exchequer and only £1231 : 12 : 4 represented foreign receipt.⁵ The whole of this foreign receipt, issued from the king's chamber in a series of *liberaciones extra cameram*, was largely earmarked for the making of arms and warlike apparatus, though sometimes intended for the general use.⁶

A quarter of a century after the ordinance of 1324 had been promulgated, its injunctions concerning great wardrobe revenue were becoming practical politics. Thus, in Michaelmas 1348 to Michaelmas 1349, of the total great wardrobe income of £8516 : 13 : 7¼, £7559 : 13 : 6¼ came from the exchequer, leaving

¹ *E.A.* 383/2. In 1306 the receiver of the Agenais was ordered to pay £50 for wax bought by the keeper of the great wardrobe from a Gascon merchant; *C.P.R.*, 1301-7, p. 432.

² *E.A.* 383/9. The necessary expenses of this year are in *ib.* 383/19, and include the carriage of armour about the country from one "garderoba armorum" to another. *Ib.* 385/1 is a roll of purchases of the great wardrobe of 4 Edw. III.

³ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/13.

⁴ *Ib.* m. 38.

⁵ *Ib.* 3/39.

⁶ See *M.R.K.R.* 126 (24 Edw. III.) breu. dir. bar. Trin. t. The king sent out of chancery to the exchequer, "quandam cedulam sigillo nostro de griffon signatam . . . diuersas summas extra cameram nostram super officio magne garderobe nostre continentem," that the exchequer might burden with them the parties concerned (June 13, 1350).

a foreign receipt of only £957 : 0 : 1.¹ Yet the foreign receipt could still be increased when the strain was severe, as when in February 16, 1350, to September 29, 1351, Buckingham's account shows that, out of a total of £11,833 : 5 : 2, receipt from the exchequer was £9771 : 14 : 5, and foreign receipt £2961 : 10 : 9.² After 1360 the exchequer became the almost exclusive source of great wardrobe revenue. For the year Michaelmas 1369 to Michaelmas 1370, the issue rolls record the payment by the exchequer to the great wardrobe of sums amounting to £3297.³ In the nearest corresponding year of Snaith's great wardrobe accounts, the receipt of the great wardrobe was only £3311.⁴ Under Richard II. almost the only "foreign receipts" were the small sums paid as rent for the portions of the Baynard castle estate let to tenants, and an occasional trifling amount accruing from sales of surplus stock.

The method of great wardrobe accounting is important not only in itself, but also because its history affords some of the most conclusive evidence of the way in which the office gradually shook off its dependence on the wardrobe and ultimately became an independent organisation, altogether separate from the *hospicium*. Three chief stages can be traced in the process.

First came the period when the great wardrobe existed in fact but not in name, ending about the same time as the provisions of Oxford were issued. Then "great wardrobe" work was simply part of the general business of the wardrobe of the household, and all that we know of the accounting is that in the early wardrobe accounts, receipts and expenses for what came to be great wardrobe goods and transactions were recorded separately. Save in the exceptional case of Roger the Tailor being directed to account directly with the exchequer, the chief evidence of sub-departmental activity was the gradual evolution of the office of *emptor et provisor*.

The second stage began in 1258, with the first appearance of the term "great wardrobe" and the crystallisation of the buyership into a definite office. The buyers were then allowed from

¹ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/45d.

² *Ib.* 3/48.

³ This calculation has been obtained by adding up the various recorded payments to Snaith in the printed *Brantingham Issue Roll*.

⁴ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/16. The period is June 29, 1369, to June 29, 1370.

£2000 to £4000 a year, and were independent enough to take a large proportion of this directly from the exchequer, or from the various collectors of the royal revenue. The great wardrobe, however, no longer accounted to the exchequer as it had in the days of Roger the Tailor. Its buyers or keepers accounted for everything to the keeper of the wardrobe,¹ and a summary of their accounts was regularly entered by the keeper in the general wardrobe accounts of his term or year. The normal place for this summary was at the end of the wardrobe account where a single *titulus* included not only the great wardrobe account but also the accounts of the queen's wardrobe, the chamberlain of wines, the hanaper of chancery, and other miscellanea.² The reason for treating such ill-assorted matters together is that the elements represented partially autonomous branches of the wardrobe, for which the authority of its keeper was technical rather than actual. This was particularly so with regard to the great wardrobe, for its heads were often laymen, merchants, king's tailors and the like, a fact which made it difficult to co-ordinate them with the ordinary officers of the wardrobe who were all clerks, and increased the tendency towards separation of great wardrobe from wardrobe proper. This tendency was, as we have seen, checked by Edward I.'s household ordinance of 1279,³ and the very fact that bills for cloth supplied to the great wardrobe were owed and paid by the wardrobe acted as an effective brake upon the great wardrobe's striving after independence.⁴

This second stage lasted until the middle of the reign of Edward II., and in the latter part of it we can discover much more than we knew before about the inner workings of the sub-

¹ *E.g.* "de quibus Egidius (de Audenarde) et Adenettus (cissor regis) debent compotum reddere in garderobera"; *Pipe*, 123/22d.

² I quote the heading of 28 Edw. I., from *L.Q.G.* p. 354 "Titulus de empicione magne garderobera anno presenti xxviii^o et de empicione vinorum . . . et de expensis domine Margarete regine Anglie una cum misis cancellarie regis et feodo cancellarii eiusdem" etc.

³ See above, pp. 370-371.

⁴ This is illustrated by the ordinary form of the "wardrobe debenture" of this period, which runs as follows: "Debentur in garderobera domini regis Nicholao Cerioli, mercatori de Janua, pro pannis ad aurum in serico emptis de eodem ad opus domini regis, Londoniis, xviii^o die Maii, anno nono, per compotum secum factum apud Westmonasterium, primo die Julii, anno eodem, quadraginta et sex libri, tresdecim solidi et quatuor denarii" (*Wardrobe Debentures*, bundle 2). The debenture is sealed with the seal of the keeper of the wardrobe. In *ib.* bundle 3, the phrase is changed to "debentur in magna garderobera."

departmental machine. We learn, for the first time, that great wardrobe accounting was organised almost precisely like that of the wardrobe itself. The clerk of the great wardrobe handed in to the wardrobe, from time to time, an elaborate statement of his receipts and expenses, every item of which could be checked by the duplicate roll of his departmental controller. These accounts ultimately found their way to the exchequer through the wardrobe, and were scrutinised with such care that errors were sometimes detected, and corrected in special memoranda, by the exchequer.¹

A third stage in the evolution of great wardrobe accounting was begun in 1318. We have seen that in the household ordinance of that year a strong effort was made to consolidate the great wardrobe organisation as a department of the wardrobe, as the best remedy for the evils of an imperfectly controlled independence. Yet despite the adoption of stringent measures, the movement in favour of autonomy was too strong to be checked. The recommendations intended to prevent confusion and loss in great wardrobe accounting were so far successful that the great wardrobe accounts speedily became much more voluminous and detailed. So voluminous did they grow that they could not conveniently be given room in the ordinary wardrobe accounts, nor could the exchequer officers continue to enrol them after the ancient fashion in the blank spaces of the pipe rolls. Both wardrobe and great wardrobe accounts began to be enrolled in the exchequer in separate rolls of their own, but the contradictory laws and practices were soon found unsatisfactory and a drastic remedy was applied six years later.

The introduction of that remedy marks the approach of the end of the most decisive stage in the development of great wardrobe accountancy. In 1324 Stapeldon's second ordinance of the exchequer² not only required the clerk of the great wardrobe to receive all moneys from the exchequer, but further defined the method by which his liveries to the wardrobe and elsewhere were

¹ For example, *E.A.* 352/3, which thus terminates: "et memorandum quod in compoto garderober de annis xiv^o et xv^o (Ed. I.) ad scaccarium reddito, oneratur idem Hamo (*i.e.* Hamo de la Legh clericus magne garderober) de viij^ml. dxxvijl. xviiijs. viij^d, et sic oneratur de xxvijl. xvjs. viij^d, plus quam sunt exitus predicti, de quibus xxvijl. xvjs. viij^d. thesaurarius garderober debet onerari; et oneratur in compoto suo anni xviiiⁱ." The effect of this was to save the clerk of the great wardrobe from the consequences of an error.

² See above, pp. 378-379.

to be made, pointing out how they were to be brought to the knowledge of the keeper of the wardrobe. It decreed, and herein lay the fundamental change inaugurated, that henceforth the great wardrobe should account directly to the exchequer. With the abolition of the obligation to account to the wardrobe and its elevation to a condition of immediate dependency upon and responsibility to the exchequer, the great wardrobe became an autonomous department of administration. That something like twenty-five years were to elapse before the new system was thoroughly applied, and that, even after that, there was a short period of reaction, are considerations which do not materially affect our conclusion.

Unluckily, though quite naturally, what happened in 1351-60, when the great wardrobe reverted to accounting to the wardrobe of the household, is obscure. For nine years no great wardrobe accounts have survived, either in original or in enrolment, and the enrolments of the accounts of the king's wardrobe are so curtailed and condensed that the information to be extracted from them is meagre and of little value. Careful examination of scattered scraps of evidence leads us to presume that the change in accountability was made on September 30, 1351, when Buckingham's first account terminated, and remained in operation until November 1, 1360, the date from which John Newbury's executors were instructed to answer for their accounts at the exchequer. What motives inspired the course, and why it was abandoned, it is impossible to do more than guess. The initial step was preceded by some delay and irregularity on the part of keeper Cook, who for the whole of his tenure, from December 22, 1345, to January 31, 1349, sent in no accounts, and only submitted to the exchequer a single comprehensive financial statement, on June 14, 1352, nearly three and a half years after he had left office. This account, preserved only in enrolment, is badly put together, showing such inaccurate arithmetic and slipshod transcription, that particular care is necessary to ascertain the amounts of receipts and expenses in its three divisions.¹

¹ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/44-47. The "summa expensarum" for 1347-49 is given on m. 45d. as £7373:6:10½, and on m. 47 as £7316:4:1½. The latter seems the right amount. There are other similar mistakes, but we read on m.46d.: "hanc sedulam liberauit hic ad scaccarium Johannes Cok . . . xiv° die Junii anno xxvj°."

The short summary of Retford's account is better done, and his successor Buckingham's first account, from February 16, 1350, to September 29, 1351, was tendered in the usual way to the exchequer, and normally treated.¹ It is curious that the change should have come about in Buckingham's time, in the light of his intimate connections with the exchequer.² It is even more curious that, while the exchequer was successfully establishing a new and a stronger control over the chamber, it should have suffered, apparently without remonstrance, the withdrawal of the great wardrobe from its immediate purview. The change may have been greater in form than in reality, and probably none of the officials felt keenly about it one way or the other. The facts, however, must speak for themselves.

The issue rolls afford proof of the limits of the emancipation of the great wardrobe from direct exchequer control. Up to and including Michaelmas term, 1351-52, the exchequer recorded its disbursements to the great wardrobe in the name of Buckingham its keeper,³ but from Easter term 1352⁴ to February 4, 1361, there is not a single instance of a keeper of the great wardrobe having taken revenue from the exchequer in his own right. The money for the great wardrobe was forthcoming as usual, but the payments were recorded as made not to Buckingham and Buckingham's successors, Robert Wingerworth, William Dalton and John Newbury, but to the then keepers of the wardrobe of the household, "by the hand" of the keeper of the great wardrobe. The only sums Dalton ever received in his own name were those issued towards the customary annual "regard," beyond his fee, payable at the exchequer.⁵ The same was the case with Newbury in the early part of his keepership. Then the whole situation is

¹ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/48 gives his account from Feb. 14, 1350, to Sept. 30, 1351; more details are to be found in *E.A.* 392/3, 4. ² See above, p. 133.

³ *I.R.* 359: the issues are to the keeper and are annotated "unde respondet," "liberatur ad scaccarium compotorum," the usual formulae of direct accountancy.

⁴ *Ib.* 363, beginning on Apr. 18, 1352. Here the payments are to keeper Retford "per manus Johannis de Bukyngham." Compare *ib.* 368 dealing with the period after Buckingham had gone to the wardrobe and had been succeeded by Wingerworth and Dalton. Here on July 19, 1353, this entry occurs: "Johanni de Bukyngham, custodi garderobe domini regis, per manus Willelmi de Dalton, clerici magne garderobe domini regis, in denariis eidem clerico liberatis per manus proprias super officio suo per breue suum de liberate, ut supra, dliij*l*. xvis. iij*l*d."

⁵ *Ib.* 374 (July 12, 1354).

cleared by an entry of February 4, 1361, which registered the restoration of great wardrobe accountability to the exchequer.¹ The real conclusion of the responsibility of the wardrobe for the great wardrobe and butlerage accounts was November 7, 1360.²

Other evidence corroborates the testimony of the issue rolls. The only difficulty is caused by Robert Wingerworth, who succeeded Buckingham on January 15, 1353,³ and died after only three months of office. Naturally he had had no opportunity of rendering any sort of account, but in 1354 his executors were forced to find security to return his accounts to the exchequer.⁴ From that it might reasonably be inferred that Wingerworth himself was accountable in the same office, but the contrary evidence of the issue rolls seems strong enough to dismiss that supposition. There is no record that such accounts were ever presented, and, if presented, they have not survived, so that we cannot obtain any guidance from them. Yet the procedure, followed on Newbury's death seven years later, rather postulated that only the exchequer had authority to consider executors' accounts.⁵ The keeper after Wingerworth was the veteran William Dalton, who acted from June 25, 1353, to the end of 1358,⁶ and the abbreviated enrolments of the wardrobe accounts of his time, record receiving from him certain remnants of his office, which could only come under the wardrobe's ken when the great wardrobe was accountable to it.⁷

The only "particulars" of wardrobe accounts still surviving

¹ *Ib.* 403. "Johanni de Newbury, clerico magne garderobe domini regis, per manus Ade de Bury in persolucionem lxvij*li.* iij*s.* sibi debitorum in magna garderoba predicta pro furrura." It is annotated. "Unde respondebit. Et respondit inde in compoto suo ad scaccarium compotorum rotulo compotorum de garderoba" (Feb. 4, 1361).

² See above, pp. 132-133, 142, and 147.

³ *C.F.R.* vi. 351.

⁴ *E.A.* 392/21. Wingerworth died before June 16, as he was then described as "late clerk"; *C.F.R.* vi. 363. On June 25 his successor was appointed and his executors were already in possession of his effects; *ib.* vi. 366.

⁵ See later, p. 435, n. 3.

⁶ For Dalton's earlier career see above, pp. 104-106, and 130, n. 7. He had been controller of the wardrobe from 1344 to 1350, and his appointment to the great wardrobe was to a less dignified office. In 1358 he acted as king's inspector or "justice" in the eastern counties for prizes of wine, wheat and non-cocketted goods liable to customs; *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, pp. 438, 448, 454.

⁷ *Enr. Acc. (W. & H.)* 4/1d record among Retford's foreign receipt £328 : 1 : 0½ from Dalton, partly "in precio diuersarum rerum remanencium penes ipsum in officio magne garderobe."

for these years cover the first and the last periods of restored wardrobe accountability. The first is that of Buckingham, from February 23, 1353, to February 22, 1354.¹ This proves up to the hilt that Buckingham, as wardrobe keeper, received the accounts of the great wardrobe. The wardrobe was debited with large sums paid by the exchequer through Wingerworth and Dalton, and Buckingham was responsible for such a distinctively great wardrobe obligation as the rent of the Lombard Street office.² Although Wingerworth's executors were ordered to account to the exchequer, we find them paying in moneys to the keeper of the wardrobe.³ The great wardrobe in fact dominated the whole of the accounts, and of the expenditure on *necessaria*, amounting to £10,888:1:11 $\frac{3}{4}$, something between six and seven thousand pounds seem to have been disbursed on matters directly affecting the great wardrobe.⁴

The second account is that of William Farley, covering November 3, 1359, to November 7, 1360, the significance of which in other relations has been noticed in an earlier chapter.⁵ Here it has a double interest. In the first place it proves by numerous details scattered about the account that the keeper of the great wardrobe and the king's butler, "called chamberlain of wines," still accounted directly to the keeper of the wardrobe. Farley paid to Newbury both his "ancient fee" and his "reward"; the wages of his clerk and yeoman; the cost of the parchment and ink used in his office, and of the renovation of the "houses of the wardrobe" in which Newbury's staff still worked. He paid also for the carriage of great wardrobe commodities and for the barrels used by the king's butler.⁶ So habituated were the customers of the great wardrobe to send their bills to the keeper of the wardrobe that a goldsmith's widow acknowledged a payment for her bill for arms as from "William Farley treasurer of the great wardrobe."⁷ The greater keepership involved now the lesser charge of the "great" wardrobe. The way in which

¹ *E.A.* 392/12. Buckingham's later accounts, 1354-57, give little additional detail; *Enr. Acc. (W. & H.)* 4/2.

² *Ib.* f. 2.

³ *Ib.* f. 3d.

⁴ *Ib.* ff. 38-39.

⁵ See above, pp. 142-148.

⁶ *E.A.* 393/11, ff. 63, 63d.

⁷ *Ib.* 393/12. "Particule compoti Cristiane que fuit uxor Willelmi de Berkyng, aurifabri." She received, in 34 Edw. III., 34/3 "de Willelmo de Farlee, thesaurario magne garderobe."

contemporaries confounded the two offices reflects their entangled relations.¹

To the historian of the great wardrobe, the second point of note in Farley's account is the certain evidence it affords that John Newbury accounted for his office to Farley from January 2, 1359, to November 1, 1360,² when his first account came to an end, just six days before Farley's own account was concluded. Before the time came for tendering his second account, Newbury had died, in June 1361.³ His successor, Henry Snaith,

¹ Compare *C.P.R.*, 1358-61, pp. 15 and 235, where notes on the roll describe both Dalton and Newbury as "clerks of the king's wardrobe."

² *Ib.* 393/11, f. 64. The relevant passage is quoted above, p. 147, n. 1. Compare *C.C.R.*, 1360-64, p. 36, where a writ to the auditors of Newbury's account makes it clear that it was not submitted to the ordinary exchequer audit.

³ He made his will on June 3, and must have died almost at once, as, on June 13, the bishop of Lincoln was ordered to sequester his property in his living of Great Rasen and elsewhere in the diocese, as he had died without accounting to the king; *C.F.R.* vii. 162; cf. p. 166. Snaith, his successor, was appointed on June 29, up to which date his executors accounted. The record is worth transcribing, not only for the light it throws on the change back to exchequer accountancy, but also as an illustration of the unexpected finds to be made when the memoranda rolls are consulted. Newbury's will is given in full. The reference is *M.R.K.R.* 138 com. Mich. rec. It runs: "Lincolnia. De executoribus testamenti Johannis de Newbury, custodis garderobe regis admissis ad comptum reddendum pro eodem:—Dominus rex mandavit hic breue suum de hoc termino in hec verba. 'Edward, etc. as tresorer et barons. Parce qe nous volons par certaines causes qe laconte quele Johan de Neubury, nadgaires clerk de nostre garderobe, qi Deux assoille, est tenuz de rendre a nous par resoun de son dit office, et le quele soleit estre renduz deuant le gardein de nostre garderobe qi pur le temps estoit, soit renduz deuant vous en nostre eschequer suisdit, vous mandons qe Robert de Stonley, clerik, et Johan de Waddesworth, executours du testament du dit Johan de Neubury, facez recevoir a rendre aconté deuant vous en nostre dit eschequer pur le dit testatour de tout le temps qil est adieriere del rendre dicelle puis qil receust son office auant dit; allouant a eux ce qe resoun voudera demander en celle partie. Done souz nostre priue seal a Westmonster. le xvje iour de Nouembre, lan de nostre regne trente quint.'

"Et modo in octavis sancti Martini (Nov. 18) predicti Robertus et Johannes de Waddesworth venerunt et cognouerunt se executores dicti Johannis de Neubury existere et se paratos esse ad reddendum regi comptum pro predicto Johanne de Newbury de garderoba predicta de tempore etc.; et se velle inde regi satisfacere de eo quod inde regi debere contigerit quatenus bona et catalla ipsius Johannis de Neubury, que ipse tempore mortis sue habuit, sufficere valebunt, protestando se ultra ea non posse seu velle teneri satisfacere regi seu cuiquam alteri. Et exhibuerunt curie testamentum ipsius Johannis de Neubury in hec verba. In Dei nomine amen. Ego, Johannes de Neubury, rector ecclesie de West Rasen, bone et sane memorie, die Jouis (June 3) proximo post festum sancte Petronille virginis, anno Domini millesimo ccc^{mo}. sexagesimo primo, condo testamentum meum in hunc modum. Inprimis lego animam

who had already kept the privy wardrobe since 1360, henceforth combined with that office the custody of the great wardrobe, beginning his account on June 29, the day of his appointment.

In November 1361 Newbury's executors were ordered to render his outstanding account, not to the wardrobe to which he had previously accounted, but to the exchequer. They at once accepted the responsibility and speedily tendered the account, the survival of which, in the exchequer archives, makes us grateful to the officials who revived Stapeldon's regulations. While great wardrobe accounts between 1357 and 1360 only survive in the form of scanty references in the general wardrobe accounts, the account delivered by Newbury's executors can still be studied, like its successors, in the exchequer enrolments. The admirable business methods which have preserved for us so many of the records of the exchequer may well make historians judge leniently the exchequer's pedantry and traditionalism.

The mandate to Newbury's executors was personal to them, but Snaith followed their example, either because definitely ordered so to do, or because, having already accounted to the exchequer for the privy wardrobe, he naturally accounted for his new charge in the same quarter. Though we cannot easily connect the interruption of exchequer control over the great wardrobe with the exigencies of the French war, we may well regard its resumption as one of the indirect results of the peace treaty. There was no longer need for exceptional measures, and the stiffening of exchequer authority was, as we

meam Deo et beate Marie et omnibus sanctis, et corpus meum ad sepeliendum ubi Deus disposidit. Item lego pro panno et cera et aliis diuersis pro sepultura mea emendis, xx *li*. Item lego fratribus predicatoribus London', x*l*s. Item lego fratribus Carmelitis de eodem, xx *s*. Item lego domino Johanni de Thorp unum par decretorum et unum pannum ad aurum vocatum Naak'. Item lego Nicholao Maryns unum ciphum argenteum cum cooperculo qui quondam fuit domine regine. Item lego Johanni de Waddesworth *cs* et unum equum nigrum. Item lego Johanni, clerico ecclesie sancti Edmundi in Lumbardstrete, London', v*j* *s*. viii *d*. Et residuum bonorum meorum lego domino Willelmo de Cheston, domino Roberto de Stoneley et Johanni de Waddesworth ad faciendum pro anima mea per superuisum dicti Willelmi et secundum disposicionem eorundem. Huius autem testamenti tales ordino et constituo executores meos, dominum Robertum de Stoneley, capellanum, Johannem de Waddesworth, et dominum Willelmum de Cheston principalem et superuisorem eorundem, qui Deum pre oculis habentes administracionem huius testamenti fideliter exequantur."

have seen elsewhere, one of the expedients used to restore the administration to its rightful position in time of peace. As far as the great wardrobe was concerned, with this resumption, changes in accountability ceased, and its subsequent financial history was singularly uneventful.

CHAPTER XV

THE PRIVY WARDROBE

IN dealing with the king's chamber and the great wardrobe, it has been necessary to anticipate the existence of the king's privy wardrobe in the Tower of London. Let us now consider this institution more at length.

The privy wardrobe arose, early in the fourteenth century, as a result of causes similar to those which, in the second half of the thirteenth century, had gradually evolved the great wardrobe from the wardrobe proper. We have already seen that the great wardrobe grew up as a warehouse of storable commodities, and that, since bulky articles could not easily be transported with every movement of the itinerant wardrobe of the court, there was a natural tendency for this storehouse to settle in one spot. As the fourteenth century proceeded, the same necessities brought about a further division. Arms and armour became of increasing importance when Edward III. was involved in long wars with the Scots and French, and, in consequence, the storehouse of arms and armour was separated from the storehouse of cloth, furniture and groceries. With France as the chief enemy, it was natural to plant the storehouse of war material conveniently accessible to the continent. Accordingly, the Tower of London, which was, for a season, housing the great wardrobe, was chosen for this purpose, the choice, no doubt, being influenced by the fact that the great wardrobe was already abandoning the Tower for an establishment of its own among the traders of the city.

The privy wardrobe had, however, only one root in the wardrobe. Another root was in the king's chamber, which, under Edward II., had developed so rapidly that it threatened to overshadow the wardrobe as the mainspring of household administra-

tion.¹ Above all, the privy wardrobe was the storehouse of the king's chamber, the more so as the Tower was, during the early years of Edward III., the English headquarters of the chamber. In fact, the modest staff necessary to keep and administer the privy wardrobe was, in the beginning, only a group of chamber officers detailed to administer the Tower wardrobe. In the importance and aggressiveness of the chamber we can recognise a special reason why the privy wardrobe should be separate from the great wardrobe. The chamber wanted a storehouse of its own, and found it in the privy wardrobe, which was strengthened when it took over the chief charge of arms and armour. In the different needs of the wardrobe and of the chamber lay the necessity for the second storehouse.

Only by slow degrees did the great wardrobe renounce all concern for those commodities. From its early days it had controlled the king's armourers and pavilioners; already in 1263 it was a place where crossbows and bolts could be stored.² Down to 1399, the king's armourers and pavilioners received their pay from the great wardrobe, and as late as the middle of the fourteenth century the keeper of the great wardrobe was still delivering bows and crossbows, sulphur and saltpetre, and metal for the manufacture of military machines and missiles.³ These activities were, however, at all times subordinate to the primary duty of providing cloth and apparel, and in the great wardrobe accounts the king's tailors always took precedence over his armourers and pavilioners. They were the real root of the matter. The rest were but adventitious, and it was only natural that the process of differentiation, which was working in every direction during the fourteenth century, should tend to separate such distinct charges as the custody of the king's cloth and the custody of the king's arms. Separate storehouses, indeed, were used long before there were separate organisations.

Even when separate organisation came, the privy wardrobe, in two particulars at least, remained for a considerable time a dependency of the great wardrobe. Thus we find in 1328 that arms and armour, contained in the itinerating *garderoba armorum*,

¹ See above, ii. 314-360, and iv. 238-311.

² *C.P.R.*, 1258-66, p. 300. Mandate to buyer of wardrobe to deliver crossbows and bolts to a royal sergeant at arms.

³ See above, pp. 389-391.

were still under the jurisdiction of Ousefleet, keeper of the great wardrobe, and that the expenses of their removal were charged to the great wardrobe account.¹ Later still, Fleet in 1334 was paid his wages as keeper of the privy wardrobe by Zouch, the keeper of the great wardrobe,² and our earliest surviving account of Fleet's expenses is dated *de tempore magistri Willelmi de la Zouche, tunc clerici (magne) garderobe regis*.³ Again, in 1337, we find another keeper of the great wardrobe, Norwell, paid Fleet not only his wages, but for the making and repair of arms and armour and other things belonging to the privy wardrobe.⁴ Such close dependence was over before Fleet died, but we see its influence in the curious intimacy of the relation between the privy and great wardrobes for the rest of our period. That influence explains, too, the occasional return of the great wardrobe to the Tower of London, and the union, in the last years of Edward III.'s reign, of the great and privy wardrobes under a single head.⁵ The great wardrobe's absence from London, and establishment at York or Antwerp, during Edward's III.'s early years of war—years in which the Tower wardrobe was taking definite shape—are probably further reasons why the privy wardrobe developed in the particular way it did.

Four chief stages may be noted in the history of the privy wardrobe. The first began early in the reign of Edward I., and lasted until 1323. During this half century a privy wardrobe, generally called *parua garderoba*, existed as a permanent storehouse, with permanent officers, but normally itinerating with the court.

It had no independent existence of its own, being strictly subordinated to the wardrobe, the chamber and the great wardrobe, and was, in short, a depot where wardrobe, chamber and great wardrobe safeguarded certain of the articles of which they had need.

¹ *E.A.* 383/19, charges "pro portagio armaturarum apud Eboracum," and "apud Nottingham," "a garderoba armorum usque ad castrum."

² *I.R.* 276/11, 8 Edw. III., Easter t.

³ *E.A.* 386/15.

⁴ *I.R.*, 294/9, 11 Edw. III., East. t., which records a payment by Norwell to Fleet "clerico camere . . . tam pro factura et reparacione diuersarum armaturarum et aliarum rerum priuatam garderobam ipsius domini regis contingencium, quam pro vadiis eiusdem Johannis et aliorum super custodia rerum predictarum existencium."

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, p. 324. See above, pp. 435-437.

The second stage ranged from 1323 to 1344 and was coincident with the long keepership of John Fleet, the first person whom we know to have been entrusted with its custody. In these twenty-one years the storehouse became an institution, but not an autonomous institution, since it remained inextricably bound up with the wardrobe, the chamber and the great wardrobe. Although it still followed the court, gradually a branch of it, which we may call its headquarters, settled down in the Tower of London. Over this branch Fleet had special authority, while he was still responsible for the nomadic privy wardrobe.

The third stage covered the keeperships of Robert Mildenhall and William Rothwell, extending from 1344 to 1360. The peculiar feature of this phase was that the privy wardrobe of the Tower severed its connection with the privy wardrobe of the court, both departments pursuing for the future separate courses. Mildenhall and Rothwell were keepers of the Tower wardrobe, and of the Tower wardrobe only. Although the Tower wardrobe maintained intimate relations with the chamber, it is now possible to distinguish in some sort between the functions of the two. In the last five years of this period the privy wardrobe became largely independent of the chamber, apparently as a result of the transformation of the chamber which took place in 1355-56.

The fourth stage began in 1360 with the keepership of Henry Snaith, and outlasted the revolution of 1399. In it the privy wardrobe cut itself loose from the chamber, and acquired officers, budgets and a definite sphere of its own. Nevertheless relations with the chamber remained constant and friendly, and there was even, toward the end of the period, a slight danger of the newly won independence being impaired. Parallel with this development went a gradual emancipation from the active control of the great wardrobe, though for a long time it is hard to draw the line between the two storehouses.

Let us now examine these four stages in detail. Then we may proceed to investigate later developments, and after that we may briefly sketch the subsequent history of the itinerant privy wardrobe, and point out the existence of other local privy wardrobes.

The first developments in the fourfold process are exceedingly

obscure. As early as 1226 there was a *parua garderoba*,¹ and in 1240 we learn that there was such a place where the king hung up his clothes.² These offices were merely rooms. During Edward I.'s Welsh war of 1277, the wardrobe accounts record the expenses of carrying the wardrobe of robes and arms about the country for the whole period of the campaign, from the king's leaving London to his return to the capital.³ The phrase does not imply anything apart from the wardrobe itself, though it does suggest some such distinction as we have made between the store and the office. It therefore prepares us for the emergence of the little or privy wardrobe.

The wardrobe accounts of the latter part of Edward I.'s reign specifically mention the king's *parua garderoba* no longer as a room, but as a modest organisation.⁴ Somewhere between 1292 and 1298, a clerk of the little wardrobe was its head, and from 1299 we know that it was officered by two valets of the little wardrobe, who were also valets of the king's chamber. As a rule, it went about with the court, but sometimes it did not, and then the valet in charge had the moderate allowance of 3d. a day for wages. One of its functions was to provide fruit for the king, which was purchased either by the valet of the little ward-

¹ *Rot. Lit. Claus.* ii. 104.

² *C.R.*, 1237-42, pp. 172, 178: "*parua garderoba in qua robe regis dependere consueverunt.*" It was the same as the "*garderoba armorum.*"

³ *E.A.* 350/26, m. 5: "*Pro carriagio garderobe regis, videlicet robarum et armorum regis, a recessu regis de Londoniis . . . usque redditum suum.*"

⁴ The texts on which the statements in this paragraph are based are as follows: "*Ricardo Chasteleyn, clerico de parua garderoba,*" *M.B.E.*, *T.R.* 202, f.7d, cf. 20d, 21 and 21d, for the movements of the little wardrobe during the Welsh campaign of 1295 (a book of wardrobe payments between 22 and 26 Edw. I.). *MS. Add.* 7965, f. 28, payment to the "*ostiarius garderobe*" for fruit, bought between Aug. 22 and Nov. 19, 1297, by Gervase de Holeweye "*vallettus parue garderobe*" for the king in Flanders in his chamber, "*quia nullum receipt fructum de Nicholao de Gotham, fructuario regis.*" Cf. *ib.* f. 32, allowance to Gotham for apples and pears bought in London and *ib.* f. 24 to Holeweye for cherries "*ad opus regis.*" "*Gervasio de Holeweye, valletto parue garderobe regis, pro pomis, piris, nucibus, castaniis, nefis (medlars) et aliis fructibus diuersis emptis per eundem, etc.*" *L.Q.G.*, 1299-1300, pp. 90-91, "*Ade de Hextildesham, valletto camere regis, moranti apud Karliolum post recessum regis, pro parua garderoba eiusdem regis, et aliis hernesiiis eiusdem garderobe ibidem custodiendis, pro vadiis suis . . . per 98 dies, percipienti per diem 3d.*"; *Ib.* p. 97; *Liber garderobe* (xxxii^o Ed. I.) in *MS. Add.* 8835/20, 40d. Gervase of Holeweye, who was valet of the little wardrobe in these years, was a king's valet who stayed in the household by the king's special order; *C.C.R.*, 1296-1302, pp. 271, 445; *C.P.R.*, 1292-1301, p. 405. There was also a "*parua garderoba regine*"; *L.Q.G.* p. 56.

robe or by the king's fruiterer, or else it was procured through the great wardrobe. Already in the early nineties, the little wardrobe was a sub-department with a name of its own, closely affiliated to the chamber and to the great wardrobe. It was administered by the same officers from 1299 and 1304. The analogy of the phrases "small seal" and "privy seal," and the fact that afterwards, notably in the fifteenth century, there was a *parua garderoba*, as well as a privy wardrobe, in the Tower, incline us to believe that the *parua garderoba* was the beginning of the privy wardrobe, especially as its relations with the chamber and the great wardrobe are so absolutely analogous to those of the privy wardrobe of later times. The only doubt is caused by the curious function of this little wardrobe in providing for the king such a commodity as fruit.¹

In the latter part of the reign of Edward II. there are several references, especially in the chamber accounts, to the king's wardrobe of robes which had valets and pages assigned to it, and travelled about with the court.² By 1322 or 1323, that organisation was also called the privy wardrobe of robes, and sometimes simply the privy wardrobe.³ It was in essence the store of arms, armour and robes, which accompanied the king's court for the use of the king and his household. In war time it was, more or less, the itinerating armoury of the household forces, at least as far as those warriors were concerned who depended upon the king for their supply of weapons and means of protection.

An itinerating wardrobe of arms, however, presupposed some central store, and in February 1290, while *Albinus scutifer de*

¹ The fruit was mostly dry, and dry fruit was included in the natural sphere of the great wardrobe. Later privy wardrobe officers kept the "king's victuals"; *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 140.

² *E.A.* 376/24: On Jan. 21, 1315, payment was made for the carriage of "la garderobe des robes et des armes de Wynd. a West'." *Ib.* 380/4: Thingden's chamber counterroll has an entry of 20s. for buying a hackney for "Colle de Saint Need, vadlet de la garderobe des robes," because the king saw him on foot. *Ib.* 397/7: Ousefleet's chamber counterroll, "paye a Thomas, page de la garderobe des robes le roi, quauoit demure en leauwe de Trente en une des nies la garderobe des robes le roi . . . q'il ne purrast aprocher au roi . . . pur le grant geleie quauoit este en lewe."

³ *Ib.* 378/17; account of Henry of Cambridge, king's tailor, 1322-23: "et in batellis, allocatis de Eboraco usque Thorp cum garderoba priuata robarum." There are several "liberaciones forinsece in priuata garderoba," one by the hands of William of Langley.

camera regis was *custos armorum regis*, both in London and at Dax in Gascony, he appointed a "valet" named Alexander, as his deputy for the custody of the armour in the Tower of London.¹ In 1300 the distinction was drawn between the coffers of the wardrobe which existed in the treasury at the Tower of London, and those which were carried about the country in the carts of the wardrobe,² and in the first year of Edward II. certain goods were delivered to the earl of Hereford by *Johan de Flete, clerk nostre seigneur le rey en la tour de Londres*.³ These three vague references we have found were perhaps the first made to that privy wardrobe of the Tower, which, under Edward III. and Richard II., men nearly always meant when they spoke of the privy wardrobe. This localised privy wardrobe is to be the main subject of this chapter.

There is no doubt that from an early time the Tower, where the king's armourers had their workshops, was the permanent place of wardrobe deposit, especially for the deposit of arms and armour, which, though under the care of the constable of the Tower, were still looked upon as wardrobe property. One of the many links between the chamber and the privy wardrobe is indicated by the fact that the moneys of the chamber were in 1322, at least partly, kept in a great chest bound with iron, in the chapel in the great Tower of London.⁴ Besides the Tower wardrobe, there were other localised wardrobes, such as, for instance, the "wardrobe at Westminster," mentioned in 1277.⁵

Although we know next to nothing about the origin of the privy wardrobe, our information becomes abundant when we enter the second phase of its history. The interest of this period centres round the personality of John Fleet. Complications arise at the outset, from the possibility of there having been more than one person of this name. It is not certain that the John Fleet, whose movements we can trace up to 1345, was the John Fleet who, in 1299-1300, paid for locks of

¹ *Chanc. Misc.* 4/5, 2d.

² *L.Q.G.* p. 58: "Johanni de Flete pro denariis per ipsum solutis pro serruris quorundam coffrorum garderober, tam apud Turrim Londonie in thesauraria existencium quam in carectis garderober carriatorum, etc."

³ *E.A.* 373/2.

⁴ *I.R.* 196/4, 15 Edw. II., M.T.

⁵ *MS. Ad.* 36,762, "pro portagio eiusdem garderober ad garderober Westmonasteriensem." There was a wardrobe at Westminster so early as 1176. See above, i. 163-164.

certain coffers of the wardrobe,¹ or the John Fleet, keeper of the wardrobe of Edward I.'s sons, Thomas and Edmund, in 1303-04,² or the John Fleet who in 1310-11 acted as cofferer of the queen's wardrobe.³ Our John Fleet probably first appeared on the rolls in 1313 and 1314 as a king's clerk. Little, however, was said of him until his appointment, on July 17, 1323, as "keeper of the part of the king's wardrobe in the Tower of London," at a wage of 100s. a year.⁴ From that office not even the revolution of 1326 dislodged him.⁵

At his appointment Fleet was either already a clerk of the chamber, or else soon afterwards became one. When he was called anything more specific than king's clerk, Fleet was, for the greater part of his official career, commonly described as a clerk of the chamber. It was as a clerk of the chamber that he tendered his earliest surviving account,⁶ and when, in July 1340, he delivered arms in the king's presence to Thomas of Snetisham, he acted "by the view and testimony of the auditors of the chamber," and at the Tower.⁷ Occasionally, mainly in somewhat later records,⁸ Fleet was even called receiver of the chamber, and he must have been the "receiver of the chamber at the Tower of London" to whom certain chamber revenue was directed to be paid in 1340.⁹ His position as receiver is, however, difficult to define, because he acted as *locum tenens* for two

¹ See above, p. 445, n. 2.

² Above, ii. 43, n. 7.

³ *E.A.* 374/5. He had vacated office by 5 Edw. II., because John Eston was then acting in the capacity of queen's cofferer; *ib.* 374/7, p. 3.

⁴ *I.R.* 225, 1 Edw. III. M.T. "Johanni de Flete, clerico, custodi partis garderobe regis in turre London, percipienti per annum c. s. pro vadiis suis quamdiu habuerit eandem custodiam, incipiente xvii^o die Julii, anno xvii^o."

⁵ On Mar. 16, 1327, he was still acting; *I.R.* 225, 1 Edw. III. M.T.

⁶ *E.A.* 386/15: "Comptus domini J. de Flete, clerici camere domini regis, de omnimodis custubus et expensis per ipsum factis in eadem camera," Jan. 25, 1333, to July 31, 1334. It is for expenses only, and the sum was no more than £49 : 10 : 11, spent all over the country. Other extant accounts of Flete are in *ib.* 387/10 (1334-35) and *ib.* 387/20 (1336-37). Both are "de tempore J. de Feriby" and are of receipts.

⁷ *Ib.* 388/1: "Este endenture tesmoigne qe le xxiv iour Avrill lan—unziesme, J. de Flete, clerik de la garderobe le roi, liura a Thomas de Snetisham" . . . (clerk of the king's ships—a large number of arrows, helmets, arms, etc.) . . . "par la veue et tesmoignance monsieur Johan de Molyns, et sire Nicol de Bokeland."

⁸ For example, John of Cologne's account as armourer, 1333-54, delivered in 1361; *Pipe*, 207/51, 36 Edward III. It includes all his receipts "per manus Johannis de Flete, nuper receptoris denariorum camere regis."

⁹ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 405.

undoubted successive receivers of the chamber, William of Kilsby and Thomas of Hatfield.¹

Like other chamber officers, Fleet accounted very tardily. He rendered his "final" account for all his offices, in connection both with the privy wardrobe and with his work as deputy for Hatfield and Kilsby, ranging from July 16, 1324, to July 1, 1341, in the July of the latter year.² This he presented not to the exchequer, but to the chamber, Edward III. directing Buckland, auditor of the chamber, to receive the whole account.³ Apparently Fleet's duties as keeper of the privy wardrobe were not regarded as differing in kind from those involved in his lieutenancy for the two receivers of the chamber. The exchequer was merely asked to assist by inspecting their records and supplying from them to the king what evidence they could find bearing on Fleet's accounts.⁴ A writ of chancery to the auditors enclosed these evidences, "under the foot of the seal," for their use.⁵ Letters patent notified to the exchequer that Fleet had completed his account, and that for his balance of £58, due to the king, he was answerable in the chamber in his next account and not elsewhere.⁶

The various titles and offices which fell to Fleet's lot are none too clearly distinguishable from each other. In 1325-26 he was described simply as clerk of the king's wardrobe,⁷ and it was as a clerk of the wardrobe that he rendered a small account of his receipts in the wardrobe in the days of keeper Richard Feriby.⁸ He was often referred to as keeper of the king's ward-

¹ For Fleet's chamber activities see also above, pp. 255-256.

² Had Fleet already presented yearly accounts? We know that he presented to the exchequer his account as keeper of the exchanges of London and Canterbury, 16-18 Edward III.; see below, p. 449. We have just seen that one of his yearly chamber accounts has survived; see above, p. 446, n. 6. Is it possible that other such accounts were presented, more or less regularly, and subsequently destroyed or lost, and that this "final" account was simply the last stage in the process?

³ *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 256; *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, pp. 354, 519.

⁴ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 354.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 519.

⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1340-43, p. 256.

⁷ *Pipe*, 171/42, 19 Edw. II.

⁸ *E.A.* 387/20: "Compotus domini J. de Flete, clerici garderobe domini regis, de denariis receptis in garderoba domini regis de tempore Ricardi de Feriby, custodis eiusdem." The account ranges from 8-11 Edw. III., but is all scratched out, and the remark added "nullius valoris; ideo cancellatur." We have already noted that Fleet's first chamber account is endorsed as "de tempore magistri W. la Zouche, clerici magne garderobe regis"; above, p. 441.

robe in the Tower of London,¹ and his successor was so designated in his patent of appointment. Though the storehouse in the Tower, of which Fleet so long had charge, was constantly called the privy wardrobe, Fleet was rarely described as keeper or clerk of the privy wardrobe in the Tower. Probably his most formal description would be clerk of the chamber, specially assigned to the custody of the privy wardrobe,² and we may even call him clerk of the king's chamber in the Tower of London.³

In the same account in which Fleet is styled clerk of the wardrobe, he is also termed clerk of the king's arms.⁴ As keeper of the king's arms in the Tower, he was ordered to provide coverlets and carpets *pro secretis aduentibus regis in Turrim*, and to supply materials for the repair of the great wardrobe houses in Lombard Street. Under him there was a Thomas of Petersfield, *valettus armorum regis apud Turrim*.⁵ In 1330 he was receiving money from the great wardrobe *super salua custodia et reparacione armorum regis*, though his business was *ad cameram spectans* and he was *clericus camere*.⁶ Elsewhere he was called in 1339 keeper of the king's armour in the Tower,⁷ and keeper of the king's victuals at the Tower of London.⁸

On May 17, 1338, Fleet was reappointed by patent, with a wider commission, as "keeper of the king's jewels, armour and other things in the Tower of London," with a wage of 1s. a day.⁹ The reason for this patent was probably the increase of Fleet's emoluments; it is unlikely that it marked the creation of a new office. From that date he was known as "keeper of the king's jewels and other things belonging to the king,"¹⁰ as well as "keeper of the king's jewels and other things at the Tower,"¹¹

¹ *E.g.* in *C.C.R.*, 1327-30, p. 321.

² This never occurs as his title, but it may be regarded as substantially summing up his position.

³ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/33 (a great wardrobe livery of cloth): "Johanni de Flete, pro diuersis rebus in cameram regis infratrussandis, cvj ulnas." The next entry shows that this "camera" was within the Tower.

⁴ *E.A.* 387/20: "domino J. de Flete, clerico armorum regis, pro denariis allocatis pro officio suo, etc."

⁵ *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/37d.

⁶ *Ib.* 3/16d. In the same account arms are delivered "in camera," by his view and testimony as clerk of the chamber, but paid for by the great wardrobe.

⁷ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 83. Cf. *Enr. Accts. (W. and H.)* 3/37.

⁸ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 140.

⁹ *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 82.

¹⁰ *Ib.* p. 153.

¹¹ *C.C.R.*, 1343-46, pp. 194, 270.

and to the end of his life he remained, "receiver of the money of the king's chamber."¹

A week after the first patent, on May 24, 1338, Fleet was appointed to the custody of the king's exchanges of London and Canterbury to hold office during pleasure, with £20 a year as his salary.² Subsequently, on October 28, 1341, the commission was enlarged.³ The London exchange was located in the Tower, and the duties of the keeper were much the same as those of the later master of the mint.⁴ This post was absolutely distinct from Fleet's other offices; there was no danger of its being confused with them, and for it he accounted in the usual way at the exchequer.⁵ No doubt his constant presence in the Tower was the reason for his appointment, and also for a similar combination of mint and privy wardrobe offices in the persons of his immediate successors.⁶ In sum, there seems to have resulted from Fleet's various appointments a general responsibility on his part for the administrative offices established in the Tower.

Such general responsibility had the effect of planting Fleet more firmly in the Tower of London. In the early period of his activity he had not spent much of his time there, for, although the privy wardrobe was fixed in the Tower, Fleet's duties had taken him all over the country. As late as the years 1333-34, his accounts show him making purchases at Burstwick, York and Pickering, paying for the carriage of the itinerant privy wardrobe up and down England, repairing the doors and windows of the king's wardrobe in the Tower of York, and paying the wages of a tailor working in the wardrobe of the king at Pickering.⁷ Not only Fleet, but his subordinates also, had functions divided between the

¹ *E.g. ib.*, 1337-39, p. 179, where he is described in 1339 as "receiver of the king's money in the Tower of London." A writ in *C.F.R.* v. 390 describes him on Sept. 28, 1344, immediately after his death, as "receiver of the money of the king's chamber and keeper of the king's jewels and *hernesia* in the Tower of London." He accounted, apparently in both capacities, with the chamber.

² *C.P.R.*, 1338-40, p. 83. His predecessor was John of Windsor, clerk.

³ *Ib.*, 1340-43, p. 305.

⁴ See for instance *ib.*, 1338-40, pp. 309-310.

⁵ *E.A.* 290/23, 24, 25. *Pipe*, 187/54, 16 E. III. 188/50, 17 E. III. 189/43, 18 Edw. III.

⁶ Fleet was also keeper of the queen's wardrobe in the Tower. This was situated in the Mansel Tower in the north-east corner of the fortress; *E.A.* 395/6; cf. *ib.* 391/6.

⁷ *Ib.* 386/15. There are here minute details of the movements of the travelling privy wardrobe.

Tower of London and the country at large. Thus we find John of Asthwayt at one time acting as a receiver of the chamber, at another handing over diverse *armature* to the clerk of the king's ships, and again paying wages to royal servants at Newcastle-on-Tyne, as *clericus garderober armorum* in 1338.¹ Yet so late as that year, 1338, Fleet and Asthwayt were grouped together as the two *clerici garderober robarum et armorum*,² although clearly the perambulating wardrobe was Asthwayt's special concern.

As time went on, the ambulatory and local privy wardrobes were more clearly separated from the central privy wardrobe of the Tower, which had become an "office," with a permanent staff and definite duties. The last step in definition and centralisation was doubtless taken at the time of the immensely increased demand for arms and armour and all other warlike preparations in the years which marked the beginning of the Hundred Years' War with France. When Scotland was the king's enemy, it was natural that the keeper of arms should do much of his work in Yorkshire. When continental enemies had to be faced, the Tower of London was by far the most convenient centre for the chief military storehouse of the crown. There was at this time a strong tendency towards centralisation generally, and, as we have seen, the London of Edward III. was much more like a modern capital

¹ He was called "Dastweyt" and "Asteweyt." He died before Aug. 2, 1340, when a writ close ordered the detention of his goods until his accounts had been rendered, "for all the time when he was receiver of the money and things reserved to the king's chamber"; *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 438. There can be little doubt that he belonged to the Tower series of receivers, and as "clerk of arms," to the period before the Tower and the "removing" privy wardrobes were fully differentiated. For example (*E.A.* 388/5), in 1337, Asthwayt was the "clericus garderober robarum," disbursing money at Berwick while Fleet was in the Tower (*ib.* m. 20, under "Nuncii"), and again there was paid "domino Johanni de Astweyt, clerico garderober robarum et armorum regis, misso per ipsum regem de London' usque ad Nouum Castrum super Tynam," whence he was to take the king's arms to Orwell for exportation abroad, 12d. a day as wages (a "vallettus" received 9d. and a porter 2d.). *E.A.* 388/9 (Norwell's controller's book, 1337-38) described Kilsby, clerk of the chamber, as delivering into the wardrobe "pro expensis hospicii," on May 10, 1338, sums "per manus Johannis de Astwege, clerici garderober robarum domini regis apud turrim London'," but probably "apud turrim" only indicates the place of the transaction, being therefore no part of Asthwayt's title. The passage is interesting as showing a certain chamber control of the "garderoba robarum." For Asthwayt's liveries of arms jointly with Fleet, see *Pipe*, 209/40, 38 E. III., and for his work at Newcastle, *E.A.* 388/8 (Cross' great wardrobe liveries).

² *E.A.* 388/5. In the grant of robes, their names follow that of Kilsby, "clericus camere," and precede those of the chaplains and wardrobe clerks.

than the London of a previous age. The establishment of the privy wardrobe in the Tower was one minor illustration of this movement.

When Fleet died in office, some time in 1344,¹ the third period of development had clearly come. His successor, Robert Mildenhall, appointed on October 17 of that year, was the first person nominated by patent to the charge of "keeping the king's wardrobe within the Tower of London."² The appointment was during pleasure, and Mildenhall was to receive Fleet's later wage of 1s. a day from the exchequer, "with two robes of two trimmings yearly, such as a clerk of the household of his estate receives, out of the great wardrobe." On him rested the responsibility of settling with the exchequer the affairs of his predecessor.³ Thus, in February 1345, Mildenhall handed to the exchequer forty-three tallies which had been issued in Fleet's name, and on the following July 8 he delivered there a canvas bag in which had been placed all the documents he could find, touching Fleet's transactions and account both as keeper of the exchanges, and also in his other capacities.⁴ An important difference to notice between Fleet and Mildenhall is that, while Fleet's office necessitated his frequently travelling about, Mildenhall's duties seem to have been limited to the Tower. From Mildenhall's appointment the itinerating privy wardrobe of the court can be treated absolutely separately from the Tower wardrobe, and will therefore no longer perplex us, while we are seeking to concentrate our attention on the Tower institution.

In the patent of appointment Mildenhall was described as a king's clerk. He was one of a numerous clan of Mildenhalls, who were yeomen or clerks of the king's household, and he attended the king on some of his Netherlandish travels.⁵ He may have been the Master Robert of Mildenhall, who was one of the original

¹ Fleet died before Sept. 28, 1344, for on that date the sheriffs of London were ordered to take possession of his goods and chattels as security for his debts to the crown; *C.F.R.* v. 390-391. Yet there is an indenture (*E.A.* 391/6), dated Aug. 8, 1346, for the delivery to John Fleet of certain articles belonging to the queen's wardrobe; compare above, p. 449, n. 6.

² *C.P.R.*, 1343-45, p. 353.

³ *M.R.K.R.* 121/237, 19 E. III. The king had ordered him to search for, and to deliver to the exchequer by indenture, "touz les roules, endentures, tailles, lettres souz nostre grant seal, priue seal et souz nostre seal de Gryffoun, et autres remembrances touchantes la compte Johan de Flete, queux vous auez en garde."

⁴ *Ib.*

⁵ *C.C.R.*, 1341-43, pp. 86, 189.

scholars of Michaelhouse, Cambridge, and became third master of that college in the early thirties.¹ This is, however, not very likely, since he is never described as "master" in the many references to him in the records. I have not seen evidence that Mildenhall was connected with the chamber before he was put in charge of the Tower wardrobe, though he was called *clericus armorum regis* in 1341-42 and, as keeper of arms, was clearly one of Fleet's subordinates,² with wages of 12d. a day when *extra curiam*. His gradual transference from court to Tower is shown in the records of his wages in the great wardrobe accounts.³ His new office at once involved connection with the chamber, and, before long, he was called clerk of the chamber, like his predecessor. But his duty to the chamber did not require regular attendance at court, for his chamber work, like his wardrobe work, was centred in the Tower, the privy wardrobe being also the wardrobe of the king's chamber.⁴ On the day of his appointment the jewels, arms and other things of the king, found in the Tower after Fleet's death, were handed over to Mildenhall in the presence of Nicholas Buckland, auditor of the chamber, who had been appointed by the king to supervise these valuables.⁵ The jurisdiction thus exercised over Mildenhall by the chamber auditor shows that, like Fleet, he, too, was regarded as subject to the chamber. Moreover, we find Mildenhall specifically described as receiver of the moneys of the chamber, for at least the period between June 22, 1346, and April 21, 1353,⁶ the latter date being within a few weeks of his retirement from the Tower wardrobe. As receiver, he appears in a chamber document as

¹ A. E. Stamp, *Michaelhouse*, p. 48. Hervey of Staunton, the founder, was a Suffolk man, and the Mildenhalls of course came from the same shire.

² *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/38.

³ *Ib.* m. 39d. He was "extra curiam" 245 days between May 1340 and Nov. 1341, 861 days between Nov. 1341 and April 1344 and 113 days between April 1344 and Nov. 1347.

⁴ *E.A.* 394/16 (1363-64).

⁵ *Pipe*, 198/34, 27 E. III., gives Mildenhall's accounts as keeper of the Tower wardrobe from Oct. 17, 1344-Sept. 29, 1351, without reference to the chamber, and then under a new heading "*ornamenta capelle regis*" continues an account for various vestments and jewels "*inventa in dicta garderoba regis infra Turrim predictam*," on Oct. 17, 1344, "in presencia Nic. de Bokeland, clerici regis assignati per ipsum regem oretenus ad supervidendum jocalia, armaturas et alias res regis in eadem Turri remanentes post mortem J. de Flete, nuper custodis eiusdem garderobe immediate ante ipsum Robertum."

⁶ *E.A.* 391/1, mm. 41-43. The problems connected with this record are discussed later, pp. 453-454.

responsible for large sums of moneys *soluti extra cameram*. At first, in 1346-47, the records described him as "supplying the place of the receiver," perhaps of Robert Burton,¹ but they referred to him between 1347 and 1351 as a *bona-fide* receiver.²

The subordinate clerks serving Mildenhall in the Tower were also described in Mildenhall's own accounts as clerks of the king's chamber.³ Among them were Thomas of Rolleston, or Roldeston, William of Tamworth and Robert of Colston. It is interesting, too, that in the chamber document already quoted Rolleston was called clerk of the secret wardrobe,⁴ secret being, of course, equivalent to privy.

The perplexing problems involved in Mildenhall's relations to the chamber are best illustrated by the chamber record which has given us the dates when he is known to have acted as receiver, already used in an earlier chapter when the receivership of the chamber was discussed.⁵ This is one of the valuable summaries whose preparation was due to the reorganisation of the chamber in 1355-56, and it records payments of moneys *extra cameram* between 1344 and 1355. These cover a wide ground, but the majority of the entries have to do with ships and armour, and the large sums spent on docks and other works in the king's manor of Rotherhithe. Wages of officers of the privy wardrobe, the expenses of various clerks of the king's ships, the cost of certain

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1346-49, pp. 161, 176, 235.

² *C.P.R.*, 1345-48, p. 252, where, under Feb. 15, 1347, he was "receiver of the moneys of the king's chamber at the Tower of London"; *C.C.R.*, 1349-54, pp. 181, 318, on June 6, 1350, and Aug. 5, 1351, he was "receiver of the moneys of the chamber."

³ *Pipe*, 198/34d, 36, 27 Edw. III.

⁴ *E.A.* 391/1: "Thome de Roldeston, clerico secrete garderober regis super factura de hucis pro balistis." He was also called "clericus priuate garderober regis." In 1348 Colston was his locum tenens, and received his costs "pro apparatu armorum regis." He succeeded Rolleston as "clericus priuate garderober" between 1351 and 1353, when Rolleston was "nuper clericus camere"; *Pipe*, 198/36. In *E.A.* 391/5 there is an indenture between John of Cologne, king's armourer, and Rolleston, clerk of the privy wardrobe, recording the list of "garniture" made by John and delivered to Rolleston between May 25, 1345, and June 22, 1349. This suggests that Rolleston's special sphere was the Tower armouries, as does the constant mention of his association with Mildenhall in charge of things kept in the Tower, e.g. *Pipe*, 198/34, where certain guns and powder are described in 1346 as in the custody of Mildenhall and Rolleston. Indeed, Rolleston is of special importance in the early history of fire-arms in England. See below, pp. 470, 475, 478, and *E.H.R.* xxvi. 671-672 and 688-691.

⁵ *E.A.* 391/1: above, pp. 255-261; cf. also above, pp. 290, 295, 308 and 451-452.

messengers and various "secret" expenses of the king¹ are also included. Though some items are similar to those in the privy wardrobe accounts, the general nature of the document is essentially the same as that of the chamber accounts.

The entries are classified under the names of five receivers.² Three of the five, Burton, Bramber and Norwich, were in the ordinary line of succession. What chiefly concerns us here is that the names of Mildenhall and his successor at the Tower, William Rothwell, were placed between those of Burton and Bramber. The dates show that Rothwell was Mildenhall's successor, and also that Mildenhall was acting as receiver at the same time that Burton, Bramber and Norwich were receiving, while Rothwell acted in the latter part of Norwich's term of office.

Combining all this information it seems impossible to refuse to Mildenhall and Rothwell, and even to Fleet, a place of some sort among the receivers of the chamber. Clearly, however, they were not in the direct order of succession, but were partial, accidental, supplementary and localised receivers. The privy wardrobe was the storehouse of the chamber, the *garderoba camere*,³ and it was only natural to connect with the localised storehouse in the capital a localised office of receipt, where the bailiff of a chamber manor could find someone ready to take his money. Such an office would also be an issuing office, whence the clerk of a royal ship could get his seamen's wages, or the clerk of the works of a royal manor the wages of his workmen. These, and like motives of convenience, made the chamber clerk, established in the Tower, the natural *locum tenens* of the real receivers.

Beyond mere lieutenancy, however, the keepers of the Tower wardrobe were, up to a certain point, receivers in their own right. Their best description is "receivers of the king's chamber in the Tower of London." This intimate connection with the chamber considerably slackened the speed at which the privy

¹ For instance, p. 23: "Egidio Melyn, lorinier . . . super factura unius ymaginis de cupro ad similitudinem unius regis," and p. 24, "super prouidentia certarum rerum de quibus rex ipsum oretenus ordinauit."

² For the dates of the receiverships, recorded in *E.A.* 391/1, see above p. 258. Of the twenty-six pages on which the account is written twenty are taken up with the issues of the two Tower men.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1388-92, p. 475.

wardrobe moved towards an independent existence. Another result was that privy wardrobe business was often transacted under the griffin seal. The separation of the great wardrobe from chamber and privy wardrobe was at the same time equally incomplete. In 1350 a writ of griffin seal records the payment of sums out of the chamber on behalf of the great wardrobe office by the hands of chamber clerks, among whom was Mildenhall.¹

Yet, in spite of all, the Tower wardrobe steadily travelled in the direction of independence, even during Mildenhall's keepership. Mildenhall drew up separate accounts of his own, which were strictly limited to his privy wardrobe functions in the Tower.² For his work of purchasing, safe-guarding and distributing the king's arms and armour and other valuable commodities placed in the Tower, he received considerable sums of money directly from the exchequer, and to the exchequer he apparently delivered his account. His work in this particular is thus clearly differentiated from his work as clerk and receiver of the chamber, though the two overlap, and though the privy wardrobe was still a part of the chamber. It is almost as easy, however, to distinguish what he did for the chamber and what he did for the privy wardrobe as it is to separate his work as keeper of the Tower wardrobe from his activities as keeper of the king's exchange or mint, another branch of his work for which he also accounted separately at the exchequer.³ There is, however, significance in the same person acting as head of both the Tower wardrobe and the exchanges, the more so as the combination began under Fleet, and was then, after a break, continued under Mildenhall from 1344 to 1353.

Mildenhall's tenure of office came to an end on May 9, 1353, the day on which he delivered the custody of the Tower wardrobe

¹ *C.W.* 1338/33: "Edward, etc. . . . Nous vous envoions une cedula, desouz nostre seal de griffon, contenant diuerses sommes paiees hors de nostre chambre sur loffice de nostre grante garderobe par diuerses fois par les mains de nos cher clers, Thomas de Brembre, Henri de Gristok et Robert de Mildenhale, clerks de nostre dite chambre, si vous mandons qe la cedula avant-dite facez ensealer desouz la pie de nostre grant seal, etc." Westminster, July 13, 1350.

² *Pipe*, 198/34, 36.

³ He accounted as keeper of the exchange or mint at London and Canterbury from 23-27 Edw. III.; *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, xi. *Enrolled Foreign Accounts*, p. 58.

to William Rothwell, appointed by a writ of April 29.¹ Rothwell was a king's clerk of good standing, who had previously been a chamberlain of the exchequer.² He had become, in 1351, archdeacon of Essex.³ After his appointment to the privy wardrobe he was called, like his predecessor, clerk of the king's chamber.⁴ The chamber, however, since 1348, had had its headquarters not in the Tower, but at Westminster, and this fact alone gave increased autonomy to the privy wardrobe. Accordingly, in Rothwell's account at the exchequer for the privy wardrobe from May 1353 until June 20, 1359,⁵ there seems to be no mention at all of the chamber, beyond the brief memorandum that, on January 20, 1355, the exchequer was told to audit Rothwell's accounts of the lands and tenements and whatsoever other things were recently reserved to the king's chamber. This suggests that Rothwell had gone on in a double relationship to chamber and privy wardrobe, like Mildenhall, up to that date, but that after it his relations with the chamber had ceased altogether. That would be the natural result of the limitation of chamber work in these years, for one incidental effect of the clearing away of the old chamber estate was the snapping of the last link between the privy wardrobe and the chamber. Again, like Mildenhall, Rothwell was also keeper of the Tower mint, and accounted separately for it.⁶ On June 24, 1360, he retired and soon after died. His final accounts were tendered by his executors, who sought to defraud the king by removing Rothwell's goods before the settlement of his affairs was concluded.⁷

¹ *Pipe*, 206/53, 35 Edw. III. For Rothwell's acquittance after his death see above, p. 307. Compare n. 7, below.

² He had been appointed Beauchamp chamberlain on Feb. 10, 1350, had entered office on Feb. 24, 1350, and had remained there until his appointment to the privy wardrobe; *M.R.K.R.* 126; *L.T.R.* 122.Com. Hill. Rec.; *I.R.* and *R.R.* 24-27 Edw. III. Nos. 349-370, and 399-421.

³ Newcourt, *Repert. Ecclesiast. Lond.* i. 72.

⁴ *I.R.* 373/3, 10, 25, 28 E. III. Mich. t.: "Willelmo de Rothwell, clerico camere domini regis." The very next entry on m. 25 is of a payment made to him as "clerico garderober domini regis infra turrin London," while on m. 27 he is called "receptor camere."

⁵ *Pipe*, 206/53. Cf. *E.A.* 392/4, moneys received by Rothwell, 9 May 1353-24 June 1360.

⁶ *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, No. xi. *Enrolled Foreign Accounts*, pp. 58-59. He accounted for the Tower and Canterbury mints and exchanges between 27 and 34 Edward III.; *Pipe*, 204/42d, 33 E. III.

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1361-64, p. 73, where Rothwell is called "late keeper of the king's jewels and other things in the Tower of London." The date is Aug. 30, 1361.

With his retirement the combination of the mint and the Tower wardrobe came to an end, and with it the concentration under a single head of all the administrative offices located at the Tower.

We have now reached the fourth and last stage in our history of the privy wardrobe of the Tower, the stage, namely, in which it was substantially, if not technically, an independent branch of the wardrobe system, and no longer an appendage of the chamber. If we have still some difficulty in defining its peculiar sphere, it is because there was, even now, much overlapping between it and the great wardrobe with some lingering dependence on that institution, and also because the ancient unity of the wardrobe system was not, at first, entirely destroyed by its various departments crystallising into separate administrative units. To all intent, this stage had been reached before Rothwell died, and the next keeper had only to take up the reins Rothwell had dropped.

The new keeper was the king's clerk, Henry Snaith, who was appointed on June 20, 1360.¹ He began to account from June 24, and ceased his responsibility on January 20, 1365.² Neither before nor after he became keeper at the Tower, had Snaith any such assured position in the chamber, as Fleet, Mildenhall or Rothwell. Yet the preamble of his first account records as his warrant not only his patent of appointment at the Tower, but the writ of January 20, 1356, by which things reserved to the chamber were to be accounted for at the exchequer.³ The inference seems to be that, before 1356, Snaith had office in connection with the chamber lands, for which, but for the writ of 1356, his accountability would have been to the chamber.

Snaith's career well illustrates the stages of promotion of a wardrobe officer, and incidentally the continued interdependence of the great and privy wardrobes. Before he took charge of the wardrobe in the Tower, Snaith had been, as we shall see,⁴ keeper of the privy wardrobe of the king's household. After a year of

¹ The patent of appointment in *C.F.R.* vii. 128, is dated June 20.

² *E.A.* 394/2. His accounts are enrolled in *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/5, June 24, 1360–July 1, 1362; and *ib.* m.9d, for July 1, 1362–Jan. 20, 1365.

³ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/5: "Et per aliud breue . . . datum xx^o die Januarii, anno xxix^o . . . de compotis omnium . . . rerum quarumunque nuper camere regis reseruatarum in scaccario predicto audiendis et terminandis, videlicet de receptis . . . arcuum, armaturarum," etc.

⁴ Below, p. 482.

office in the Tower he was appointed, on June 29, 1361, keeper of the great wardrobe,¹ and from 1361 to 1365 he combined the keeperships of two wardrobes. Snaith was not, however, allowed to draw the salaries for both posts, and the payments to him of wages from the privy wardrobe were suppressed.² When, in 1365, he abandoned the dual charge, he continued as keeper of the great wardrobe for six years longer.

Snaith's successor at the Tower, John Sleaford, king's clerk, followed an exactly similar course of promotion. He was keeper of the privy wardrobe from January 20, 1365, to the death of Edward III. on June 21, 1377,³ and from November 6, 1371, he duplicated this post with the keepership of the great wardrobe. Unlike their immediate predecessors at the privy wardrobe, neither Sleaford nor Snaith was ever keeper of the king's exchanges.⁴

We have seen already the curious circumstances in which Sleaford was relieved of the responsibilities of the great wardrobe under the new reign. His relation to the privy wardrobe in the early months of Richard II. was equally ambiguous. With Edward III.'s death, the writ by which Sleaford had been appointed ceased to have force. As he was never reappointed under Richard II., we cannot strictly call him the first keeper of the privy wardrobe of the new king. Nevertheless, it was not until July 20, 1378, that he resigned the office to his successor, John

¹ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/6. See above, p. 384.

² *E.A.* 394/2. "quo quidem die, xxix° Junii, rex officium magne garderobe sue eidem Henrico custodiendum et habendum, una cum officio predictæ priuæ garderobe regis infra turrin London., commisit. Rex tamen vult quod idem Henricus vadia pro se ipso in officio dictæ priuæ garderobe regis a predicto die xxix° Junii non percipiat, nunciante thesaurario Anglie." On Apr. 4, the prior and convent of Leeds received a concession from the king that the corrody for life which, at the king's request, they had granted to "John Serle, deceased, deputed to the keeping of the king's wardrobe in the Tower of London" should not be regarded as a precedent; *C.P.R., 1364-67*, p. 224. There appears to be no evidence of whom he was the deputy, but probably he acted in that capacity for Snaith.

³ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/19d, 27; *E.A.* 395/6. He must be distinguished from William Sleaford, who was at the same time "clericus operacionum regis infra palacium Westmon. et infra turrin London.;" *I.R.* 436/16, 43 E. III. M. t. But the exchequer itself failed sometimes to make the distinction clear. See, for instance, *ib.* 429, where, under Mar. 2, 1367, "William," clerk of the privy wardrobe in the Tower, is written instead of John. The employment of both John and William in the Tower, though in different capacities, made the confusion very natural. See above, p. 384.

⁴ *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, xi. p. 59. John Thorpe followed Rothwell, acting 35-49 Edw. III., and Richard Lyons succeeded Thorpe, 49-50 Edw. III.

Hatfield, and up to that date he continued "burdened with the office and making certain deliveries."¹ His official style was, however, "keeper of the privy wardrobe of our grandfather," or "recently keeper."²

John Hatfield, who had been clerk of the king's ships from, at least, 1370 until the death of the old king,³ was appointed keeper of the privy wardrobe in the Tower by patent on June 3, 1378,⁴ and received delivery of its contents on July 20, 1378.⁵ A year later he was ordered to account at the exchequer for the whole period since Edward III.'s death, including the time during which Sleaford had remained in actual charge of the contents of the Tower wardrobe. Hatfield received the customary salary of £20 a year and continued in office until September 24, 1381, when he delivered his charge to his successor. Unfortunately Hatfield soon died, and there was considerable delay before his account could be presented by his executors.⁶ The accounts show that, for the years 1377-81, the functions of the office were limited practically to the safe custody of existing stores.⁷

During Hatfield's short and obscure tenure of office, one of

¹ Several instances are in *E.A.* 396/15. For example, a privy seal order of Sept. 21, 1377, to deliver six "balistes de nostre meillure, estauntes dessouz vostre garde" to the keeper of Calais. Another of May 4, 1378, ordered Sleaford to give the king by his master carpenter, "deux petitz canons esteantz en vostre garde." See also n. 2 following.

² See *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/27, which gives Sleaford's account until June 21, 1377, "quo die auus obiit et dictum breue (*i.e.* of his appointment) suo robore carebat et virtute. Tamen idem Johannes de eodem officio stetit oneratus ab eodem xxi^o die Junii, et diuersas liberationes in eodem officio fecit usque xx^m diem Julii, anno regis huius secundo, pretextu diuersorum breuium de priuato sigillo regis huius." In *E.A.* 396/15, he is called in a privy seal of Sept. 21, 1377, "gardein de la priue garderobe qe feust a nostre cher sire et ael le roy qe Dieux assoill."

³ *Ib.* 396/16; cf. *ib.* 400/10.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 225.

⁵ *E.A.* 400/5: "Hec indentura testatur quod Johannes de Sleaford, nuper clericus priuate garderobe domini regis liberauit Johanni de Haytfeld, clerico priuate garderobe domini nostri Ricardi, regis Anglie secundi, infra Turrim predictam, ad opus ipsius domini nostri Ricardi custodiendum particulas subscriptas," July 20, 1378.

⁶ There is reference in them to a writ of 10 Richard II., so that five years must have passed since Hatfield's death; *L.T.R. Enr. Acc. F.* 9 Ric. II., 20.

⁷ These facts are clearly brought out in the preamble to Hatfield's account, which survives in a mutilated form in *E.A.* 400/10. In the following transcript the words in square brackets, entirely obliterated in this version, are supplied from *L.T.R. Enr. Acc. F.* 9 Ric. II., 20/G. "Compotus Johannis de Haytfeld', defuncti, nuper clerici araiamenti nauium et bargearum regis Edwardi tercii, aui regis huius, ac custodis priuate garderobe regis huius infra Turrim London.,

the most dramatic incidents in the history of the privy wardrobe occurred. On June 13, 1381, at the height of the Peasants' Revolt, the insurgents, profiting by the momentary absence of the king, burst into the Tower without encountering any real opposition from the garrison. The outrages they committed there, and, in particular, the cruel murder of archbishop Sudbury, are told at length in all the chronicles. One incident, however, escaped their attention, and has up to now remained unknown to modern historians. Indeed, Dr. Stubbs remarked that "not much was said about spoilation," and he regarded the rebels as acting with policy in keeping nothing for themselves.¹ Policy may well have restrained the rioters from promiscuous robbery, but it was common prudence for them to provide themselves with arms. The account of Hatfield's executors shows that the rebels made no scruple to spoil the stores of the privy wardrobe, the absence of Hatfield from his post and the scattered and unprotected state of the armouries facilitating the theft.

Obliged to account for all the arms and armour which Hatfield had handled in receiving, releasing, or storing them, Hatfield's executors drew up an exact list of the articles the rebels had removed from the Tower. That list makes it clear that only a small section of the Tower armouries was accessible to the mob,

per breue regis patens, datum tercio die Junii, anno primo (1378) irrotulatum in originalibus de eodem anno, per quod breue rex constituit ipsum Johannem custodem dicte priuate garderober regis . . . et per aliud breue regis . . . datum xx^o die Julii, anno tercio (1379) . . . per quod breue rex mandauit eisdem thesaurario et baronibus quod computent cum prefato Johanne . . . a die mortis dicti aui usque ad diem quo idem Johannes per regem custos dicte garderober extitit constitutus, ac eciam computent cum prefato Johanne . . . de tempore quo sic extitit in officio illo, usque predictum xx^m diem Julii, anno tercio . . . et per aliud breue regis . . . xii^o die Decembris, anno x^o (1386) . . . per quod breue rex mandauit eisdem thesaurario et baronibus quod Johanni Knyght, vni executorum testamenti predicti Johannis, id quod aretro fuit eidem Johanni de Haytfeld' de feodo predicto dum in officio predicto sic stetit . . . allocent . . . [a xxi^o die Junii, anno primo, quo die] idem auus obiit, ante quem diem idem Johannes de arraiaimento dictarum nauium et bargearum et Johannes de Sleaford' de custodia dicte garderober ipsius aui inde computauit . . . usque predictum tercium diem Junii proximum sequentem, [quo die rex constituit ipsum Johannem de Haytfeld'] custodem dicte garderober, vt supra, ac eciam de consimilibus empcionibus, custubus, et expensis ac feodo predicti Johannis [a predicto xx^o die Julii anno tercio], quo die recepit officium dicte priuate garderober regis . . . [de dicto Johanne Sleaford'] . . . vsque xxiii^m diem Septembris, anno quinto, quo die idem Johannes de Haytfeld' liberauit custodiam dicte garderober . . . Johanni de Hermesthorp. . . ."

¹ C.H. ii. 480 (1887).

but the arms and armour removed may well have made all the difference to the rebels in arming themselves to withstand the king's troops. Among the objects stolen were 110 coats of mail, 21 helmets and 67 "weak doublets." The taking away of 12 standards of the king's arms and the arms of St. George is a curious bit of evidence of the insurgents' persistent loyalty to the crown. Apart from more than 900 bows, they secured very few weapons, only 3 swords, 7 pikes and a few sheaves of arrows. Two cannon, however, were carried off, though no gunpowder or balls,¹ and there is no evidence that they made any use of these cannon.

Hatfield's successor, John Hermesthorpe, only kept the privy wardrobe for a few months, and he was mainly occupied in the exchequer, where he acted as Beauchamp chamberlain between 1376 and 1389.² His appointment to the privy wardrobe at a time of crisis looks like an emergency one, and was perhaps suggested by the fact that he had, since 1368, a local establishment near the Tower as warden of St. Katharine's hospital.³ His chief work at the privy wardrobe was strengthening its buildings and providing them with efficient fastenings and defences to save a repetition of the troubles of 1381. One strenuous day was devoted to removing privy wardrobe stores from the "queen's chamber" in anticipation of the arrival of Anne of Bohemia for her marriage.⁴

¹ *E.A.* 400/10. The particulars of the rebels' thefts are perhaps worth transcribing: "Et in asportacione diuersorum loricarum, bacynnettorum, auentallorum et aliarum armaturarum et artillarie regis inuentorum in predicta garderobera regis per communes rebelles insurgentes contra pacem regis, anno quarto, videlicet—cx loricis, xxi bacynnettos, iiij^{xx} xij paria cirothecarum de plate, i par vaumbras et rerebras, lj paria dim. vaumbras, unde viij paria dim. de coreo, l par dim. rerebras, dcccix arcus, l hauncepes non garnis', vij pykoys, xx capita pro springaldis, xij baneres, vocate standard, de armis regis et sancti Georgii, lxiiij auentaill, v pysans, v par. paunces, ij par. splentes, ij gladii, lxvij doubletti debiles, iiij^{xx} x jakes, l testr. de rubeo raycordele, x haunches, vj bauderyks, ccx capita quarellorum, xv garbes sagittarum, xvi sagittas, mdc iiij^{xx} iv capita sagittarum, xxij hachettos, xij tribul., l coffre pro armaturis intrussandis, li springaldshattes pennate cum stanno, ij gunnes, xxv quarellos pro springaldis cum capitibus, lxj banerstafes et mmdl. quarellshafes debiles non pennate sine capitibus." Cf. what Gower says about the arms of the rebels in *Vox Clamantis*, bk. i. ch. xii., iv. 45-46, ed. Macaulay. I do not know in what part of the Tower the privy wardrobe was located; but it included in Sleaford's time (1375-77) a "cameram priuate garderobera super aquam pendentem" (*E.A.* 397/19), which suggests a workshop on the river frontage.

² *M.R.K.R.*, 153, Com. rec. Mich. t. He was still acting on Nov. 10, 1389; *C.P.R.*, 1388-92, p. 157.

³ *Ib.*, 1367-70, p. 338.

⁴ See later, p. 465, for references.

Otherwise his operations were on as modest a scale as Hatfield's. He accounted from September 24, 1381, to May 9, 1382, the date on which he handed over his office to Randolph Hatton.

Hatton's account ranges from May 9, 1382, until January 16, 1396, the day of his death.¹ He found the office in such confusion that it was only after inquiry at the exchequer that he could ascertain what was the accustomed fee of the keeper and whether or not he was wont to receive a grant of robes.² Under his guidance the privy wardrobe again became active, notably because of the extended use of fire-arms during his keepership.³ He was succeeded by John Lowick, appointed by patent on January 1, 1396, who remained in office until November 1, 1399, a few weeks after Richard II.'s fall. Lowick was variously described as yeoman of the chamber, king's esquire and receiver of the chamber, and enjoyed the distinction of being the first layman to keep the Tower wardrobe.⁴

We may congratulate ourselves on possessing, besides a few of Fleet's accounts, a substantially unbroken series of privy wardrobe accounts from Mildenhall's appointment, in 1344, to 1399. Of Mildenhall's account there survives only the enrolment in the pipe roll, but both particulars and enrolment of most of his successors' accounts are extant.⁵ Valuable light is also thrown upon the office and its accounting by the great bundles of "documents subsidiary to the accounts of the privy wardrobe," especially by the large number of privy seal writs among them, and the indentures between outgoing and ingoing keepers are of special importance. From all these sources it is possible to form a precise and detailed conception of the sphere and operations of the Tower wardrobe.

¹ *L.T.R.*, *F. Accts.*, 19 Ric. II. (now No. 30) m. 29 E; *E.A.* 400/22, 23. His appointment was on May 9; *C.P.R.*, 1381-85, p. 14. Though *E.A.* 400/15 says Hermesthorpe delivered his office to Hatton on May 5, the indenture of delivery is dated May 9, *E.A.* 400/16.

² *M.R.K.R.*, 159, breu. dir. bar. The exchequer had to search the wardrobe and great wardrobe accounts as well as its own records.

³ See below, pp. 472-474.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1391-96, p. 668. He had authority to exercise the office by deputy. I call him Lowick, rather than Luftwick, because it is the modern form of a recognised place name. The manor of Lowick, Northants., was part of the estates of the Green family, the supporters of Richard II.; *C.Ch.R.* v. 300.

⁵ The accounts of Rothwell and Mildenhall were enrolled in the pipe rolls; later accounts were enrolled either in the "wardrobe and household," or else in the "foreign" series.

Fleet's extant accounts are so fragmentary that it would be rash to dogmatise about his receipts and expenses. They tell us that his expenses for the eighteen months between January 25, 1333, and July 31, 1334, only reached £49 : 10 : 11,¹ and that his total receipts for the two years, 8 and 9 Edward III., were but £335 : 7 : 4, while for the two following years they were as little as £8 : 18 : 2.² Clearly, either his transactions were on a much smaller scale than those of his successor, or else these documents represent only a part of his activities. From the death of Fleet in 1344 to the death of Edward III., the receipts of the privy wardrobe were singularly uniform, if the average annual receipt under each keeper be taken as the unit of reckoning, although the custom of the keepers of sending in to the exchequer one account, extending over a term of several years, often makes it difficult for us to calculate the actual receipts for each year. Under Mildenhall the average annual receipt was £508 ;³ under Rothwell, £540 ; and under Sleaford, £520. There was only one exception to the general rough average of £500 in the keepership of Snaith, when for four years and a half, between 1360 and 1365, the average was no higher than £100 a year. Yet this decline does not seem to have been expected, for in the summary of expenses for the years 1359–63 drawn up by the exchequer, the cost of the privy wardrobe and of the provision of bows and arrows is set down as £1236 in these years.⁴

When we break up the accounts, we find that, though the average was constant, the actual yearly receipts and expenses fluctuated considerably. During Sleaford's long keepership four accounts were submitted. The first, for the five years from 1365 to 1370, showed a receipt of £4003 : 5 : 8,⁵ giving a yearly average of as much as £800, by far the highest in our period. This may be partly accounted for by the renewal, in 1369, of the French war, and partly by a rebound from the excessive economy of the days of Snaith. In the account for 1370–73 the receipts amounted to £1640 : 2 : 8, yielding an annual average of £546 for the three

¹ *E.A.* 386/15.

² *Ib.* 387/20. These are the "denarii allocati pro officio suo," but the whole roll is cancelled : "nulus valoris, cancellatur."

³ Mildenhall's accounts are in *Pipe*, 198/34, 36, 27 E. III.

⁴ *E.H.R.* xxxix. 418.

⁵ *E.A.* 395/1. The account is from Jan. 20, 1365, to Jan. 20, 1370.

years.¹ During the next two years the average fell to £435,² while for the last two and a half years of the old king's reign it declined to £150.³ These details indicate that in the last period of Edward III.'s reign the operations of the privy wardrobe were steadily contracting.

Under Richard II. the restricted sphere of the privy wardrobe was even more noticeable. We know that John Sleaford, though in charge for the first year of Richard II.'s reign, was neither called keeper nor delivered an account, because his successor, John Hatfield, was specially ordered to account from Edward III.'s death.⁴ Nevertheless the receipts for the four years and a quarter for which Hatfield accounted showed a total amounting to £237 only, an average of barely £56 a year, of which nearly a third came from sales.⁵

Hermesthorpe's short account was concerned with still more insignificant sums. His receipt, all from the exchequer, amounted to £13 : 6 : 3, paid to him "for powder and for the making of doors and locks to the houses of the Tower." At this rate the average would be £24 per annum.⁶ However, he spent £27 : 10 : 7, twice as much as he received, on his own wages, on saltpetre, on thirteen "great locks" and ten locks of lesser price for the privy wardrobe,

¹ *E.A.* 396/14.

² *Ib.* 397/10, Jan. 20, 1373–Jan. 20, 1375. The sum of receipts was £871 : 16 : 4.

³ *Ib.* 397/19. The period was Jan. 20, 1375–June 21, 1377, and the receipt £375 : 8 : 6; cf. *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 4/27. Of this, not less than £333 : 6 : 8 was received in Michaelmas term, 1376–77. There were no dated receipts at all in 49 and 50 Edw. III., and only £14 : 1s. in Michaelmas term, 48 Edw. III. The undated receipt was only £28 : 0 : 10.

⁴ Above, pp. 458–459. Sleaford's last account was originally framed to end on June 4, "anno regni Ricardi, regis Anglie, secundo," but this phrase is erased and the account stops at June 21, 1377, "quo die idem rex obiit." However, his liveries went on until July 6; *ib.* 397/20, 1377, "quo die predictus rex sepultus fuit apud Westmonasterium"; *ib.* 398/1 is a duplicate and more final version of the two above accounts, reciting how Sleaford was directed to continue certain liveries until July 20, when he delivered all his stores to Hatfield.

⁵ *Ib.* 400/10, *Enr. Accts.* F. 9 Ric. II. (No. 20) G., give the details. "Recepta scac." : 1 Ric. II., £20; 2 Ric. II., £80 : 9 : 6; 3 Ric. II., £24 : 18s.; 4 Ric. II., £24; total, £149 : 7 : 6. The "recepta forinseca et venditionum coniuncta" were all in 3 Ric. II., save an undated £11 : 14 : 4, and amount to £88 : 7 : 8, apparently mainly from sales of stock. The keeper's salary was £20, so that in 1 Ric. II. all that was given by the exchequer to the privy wardrobe was the salary of its head, and in 3, 4 and 5 Ric. II. this sum was only exceeded by four or five pounds.

⁶ *E.A.* 400/15; *Enr. Accts.* F. 10 Ric. II., now No. 21, F. (m. 14d).

to prevent fresh riotous invasions, and on clearing out from the "queen's chamber" the arms which filled it, preparatory to queen Anne's arrival for her wedding.¹ Undoubtedly, during Richard II.'s minority the privy wardrobe was extremely inactive. The exchequer, as a rule, did little more than pay the keeper's salary and give him such money as was absolutely necessary for some immediate want, while extra expenses were met, more or less, by the sale of old stock. In these years, at least, the privy wardrobe was a storehouse, purely and simply, for it had no money to purchase or to manufacture, and hardly any even for the repair of the arms entrusted to it.

In Hatton's long keepership there was some slight improvement. The account for his fourteen years of office, from 1382 to 1396, showed a total receipt of £2973 : 18 : 5½,² which averaged £212 per annum. But the receipts varied greatly from year to year, dropping from £580 in 1386-87 and £555 in 1389-90 to nothing at all in 1388-89 and 1390-91. All the larger totals coincide with the few military efforts of the time, the domestic danger and the Scots expedition of 1385, the preparations to resist French invasion in 1386 and the Irish expedition of 1394-95. A special feature of these accounts is the suggestion they excite that a section of the privy wardrobe quitted the Tower and

¹ *E.A.* 400/15 : "item xvij hominibus conductis per unam diem pro euacuacione camere domine regine cum magna festinacione contra aduentum suum versus dictam turrim." The chests of arms which encumbered the queen's bedroom were removed "usque magnam turrim et turrim vocatam le Watergate." The cost of all this was 9s.

² Hatton's accounts are in *E.A.* 400/22 and 23, and most fully in *Enr. Acc.* F. 19 Ric. II. (No. 30), E. (m. 29). The yearly receipts work out as follows : 6 R. II., £95 : 0 : 5 ; 7 R. II., £121 : 18 : 1 ; 8 R. II., £320 : 12 : 3 ; 9 R. II., £270 : 11 : 11 ; 10 R. II., £580 : 13 : 4 ; 11 R. II., £179 : 5 : 2½ ; 12 R. II., none ; 13 R. II., £555 : 12 : 5 ; 14 R. II., none ; 15 R. II., £23 : 6 : 8 ; 16 R. II., £95 : 16 : 0 ; 17 R. II., £240 ; 18 R. II., £466 : 13 : 4 ; 19 R. II. (part only), £20 ; undated £3 : 8 : 9½ ; grand total, £2973 : 18 : 5½. The variations correspond to the fluctuations in military expenditure. Thus, when in 8 R. II. (June 1384-June 1385) Richard was having "large warlike machines" made in the Tower for "certain urgent and secret affairs" (Devon's *Issues*, p. 227), £320 were spent. On Aug. 6, 1385, again, Richard invaded Scotland with a large army and ravaged the Lowlands, and the high receipt of 8 and 9 Ric. II. were among the effects of this expedition. The £580 receipt of 10 Ric. II. (June 1386-June 1387) are accounted for by the preparations to meet the French invasion threatened between Aug. and Nov. 1386. The receipt of 13 Ric. II. (June 1389-June 1390) we may connect with the preparations made by Richard to arm himself after he had shaken off the yoke of the appellants. The last considerable receipt, in 18 Ric. II. (June 1394-June 1395), coincides with Richard's first Irish expedition of Sept. 1394-May 1395.

attended or followed Richard to Scotland and Ireland. Eleven *sagitarii de corona*, who accompanied Richard to Scotland in 1385, were not only armed and equipped, but even paid by the Tower wardrobe.¹ Wages were paid to a clerk and a valet dispatched to the king in Ireland with the arms and artillery he required, and on his second Irish visit, the king ordered the clerk to remain in Dublin castle to safeguard the arms stored there.² The highest average receipt in Hatton's keepership belonged to the first six years : for the latter part of his tenure the receipt, except in an emergency, was exceedingly small.

Lowick's receipts in his first account for the years January 20, 1396–January 20, 1399, amounted to £486 : 13 : 4, with a yearly average of only £162, but the receipts of his last account, from January 20 to November 1, 1399, reached £501 : 17 : 7,³ a sum partly accounted for by the cost of the arms, armour and artillery prepared for the king's expedition to Ireland, and by the expense of their carriage to and from that country. This account covered less than a year, and dealt with as great a receipt as any since Edward III. had died. As Lowick was with the king in Ireland for much of this time, his Tower work must have been done by deputy. Perhaps we may see, both in the increased volume of Lowick's later transactions and in the renewal of the connection of the keepership with the receivership of the chamber, illustrations of Richard's reactionary policy.

In both reigns alike, the greater part of the receipts of the privy wardrobe came directly from the exchequer, and it was to the exchequer that the keeper tendered his accounts. We are definitely told that all Rothwell's receipts came from the treasurer and barons, and payments from other sources generally seem to have been exceptional. In the year Michaelmas, 1369, to Michaelmas, 1370, the payments to the privy wardrobe recorded on the issue rolls amounted to £544 : 6 : 10, a sum within a few shillings of Sleaford's average receipt for the three years within which this period fell.⁴ Some money, however, was occasionally provided by the chamber, as when, in 1367, Helming Leget paid Sleaford for coats of mail bought for the king's use.⁵ The expenses were

¹ *E.A.* 400/22.

² *Enr. Acc. F.* 1 H. IV. No. 34.

³ This includes the first month of Henry IV.'s reign. His accounts are in *Enr. Acc. F.* 1 R. II. (No. 32) H., and 1 Hen. IV. (No. 34) G.

⁴ Devon's *Brantingham Issue Roll*, *passim*.

⁵ *E.A.* 395/1.

sometimes a little in excess of the receipts, but generally expenses and receipts were nearly balanced.¹ Evidently the exchequer doled out to the privy wardrobe no more than enough money to meet actual necessities.²

The close dependence of the privy wardrobe on the exchequer is also shown in other ways. The exchequer controlled the sheriffs and other local officers who supplied the Tower wardrobe with a large part of its stores, and, on the order of the treasurer and barons, the keeper might be compelled to abandon his post and travel about the country. Keeper Hatfield was absent on such a mission when the rebels of 1381 looted the stores of the Tower wardrobe, but even so, the exchequer caused a good deal of trouble before it acquitted Hatfield's executors for the loss of arms, and only eventually agreed to accept the explanation on the executors taking oath as to the truth of their allegations. One reason for this strict dependence was doubtless the fact that, before the privy wardrobe reached maturity, the exchequer had fought and won its long battle with the household departments for exclusive financial control. Indeed this dependence is one of the pieces of evidence that the privy wardrobe was nominally a household department.

The modest finances of the Tower wardrobe bespeak the limited scope of its operations. Despite its name, somewhat misleading, of privy or private wardrobe, the wardrobe of the Tower was, of all branches of the wardrobe establishment, the least concerned with what, to modern eyes, were the personal expenses of the sovereign.

¹ For instance, Mildenhall's expenses were £4751:14:9½ and his receipt £4405:9:2. Rothwell's receipts were £3669:3:4 and his expenses £3515:15:11. Sleaford's receipt between 1365 and 1370 was £4003:5:8 and his expenses £3998:0:3½. Hatfield's receipt of £237:15:2 between 1377 and 1381 included "recepta scaccarii £149:7:6," "recepta forinseca et venditionum" £88:7:8; *Enr. Acc. F.* 9 Ric. II. (No. 20) G. (m. 7); compare n. 5, p. 464, above.

² This is well illustrated by a warrant to the exchequer, under secret seal, now preserved in *Exch. of Receipt, Warrants for Issue*, bundle 4, dated July 15, 1342. "De par le roi. Come nous eoms assigne nostre cher clerik Robert de Mildenhale affaire apparailler noz engins et noz hurdis en nostre Tour de Londres, et de les faire eskipper pur les mener outre mier ovesqe nous, ensemblement et noz pavillons auxint faire eskipper, queu chose demaunde grant haste et ne poet estre faite sanz ce qom eit deniers en mein, vous mandons qe vous deliverez au dit Robert dys livres daprest sur les overames susdites, et qil les eit tantost vewes cestes, issint qe les choses susditz ne soient targiez ne a deriere au temps de nostre passage. Done souz nostre secre seal a nostre park de Wyndesore, le xv jour de Juil,"

We have often had occasion to remark that the fourteenth century in no wise recognised a difference between the king's private and his public establishments. The king's army and navy were as much his private concern as were the expenses of his household, and the satisfaction of his personal needs. There was nothing incongruous, therefore, in a portion of the military budget being set down as the expenses of the private wardrobe of the sovereign. The privy wardrobe account was, as Sir James Ramsay has well said, "an account for arms kept at the Tower," and, therefore, "ought to be allowed as military expenditure."¹

This fact is brought out clearly in the accounts in which Tower wardrobe expenses were divided into two chief groups. The first of these was headed *necessaria*, and covered the cost of maintaining the Tower office. It therefore included such items as the wages of the keeper and his subordinates, the expenses incurred in the administration of the office, the cost of the parchment on which the letters and rolls were written and of the ink used in writing them, and the cost of three horses at sixpence a day each, employed in carrying the king's crown and great dishes from the Tower to the court for the great festivals.² The items in the second group were sometimes defined as "the purchase and manufacture of arms and armour within the privy wardrobe during the time of this account." This distinction was made, for instance, in the accounts of Sleaford for the years 1365-70.³ During these five years, Sleaford's *necessaria* amounted to only £370 : 8 : 9, and thus averaged less than £75 a year, while the *empciones et facture*, in which we must include the cost of storing, cleaning, repairing and transporting the arms and other articles entrusted to the Tower office, came, for the same period, to £3627 : 10 : 7½, averaging £653 a year. The *necessaria* seem constant, while the *empciones et facture*, swollen in these

¹ In his valuable papers in the *Antiquary*, and especially in *Antiquary*, vi. 103, Sir James Ramsay has shortly, but clearly, indicated the real nature of the privy wardrobe.

² *E.A.* 392/14; Rothwell's account. Jewels were entered as a subsidiary element in these accounts; but for them, as for the king's crown, the keeper was responsible for custody only.

³ *Ib.* 395/1, the heads are "*necessaria*" and "*empciones et facture armaturarum infra Turrim London.*" In Sleaford's account for 46-48 Ed. III. (*ib.* 397/10) the divisions are "*super officio suo*" and "*super providentiis diuersarum rerum tangentium guerram.*"

later years by the renewal of the French war, varied according to circumstances.

The accounts show that the privy wardrobe continued to be primarily a place of safe custody. Valuable articles, such as jewels and plate, were entrusted to it,¹ but the custody of jewels and plate was always strictly subordinate to the main function of storing arms and armour. Besides the elaborate inventories of the contents of the privy wardrobe at the moment of the transference of its custody from one keeper to another, other records prove that conclusively. Such evidence, for instance, is contained in the lists of arms handed in to the king's chamber for the king's personal use in hunting and in campaigning,² for the use of his armies, and for personal gifts to his friends. There are also registered the delivery of arms and armour to the king's ships, castles and fortified towns, the provision of equipment for the armies in the field, and the transport of jewels and plate to and from the court and the Tower.³

The inventories show how considerable were the stores kept in the privy wardrobe. The largest stocks were the requisites for archery. Thus, in 1360, Rothwell had in his custody, 4062 "painted bows," 11,303 "white bows," 4000 bow-staves and 23,643 sheaves of arrows.⁴ Sometimes the equipment of an expedition, or a severe domestic disturbance, depleted the Tower store of the national weapon to a dangerously low level, as in 1381, when Hatfield delivered to his successor only 995 sheaves of arrows.⁵ There was also an immense variety of other arms and armour, such as quivers of two sorts to meet the needs of the foot archers and horse archers; saddlery and all kinds of horse-trappings; barrels in which arrows and bolts were packed; cross-bows and bolts, shields, pikes, lances, hatchets of war;

¹ So important were the jewels that so late as Aug. 30, 1361, ex-keeper Rothwell was styled in a patent "*nuper custos jocalium et aliarum rerum nostrarum in Turri.*" Among the jewels normally kept in the privy wardrobe was the famous "*Croice Gnyathe*," which was preserved in a coffer; *Pipe*, 198/34, 27 Edw. III. A list of plate, received by Mildenhall from Burton, is in *ib.* m. 34d.

² *E.A.* 394/14: "*et regi in cameram suam pro venacione domini regis in forestis de Shyrewode et Rokyngham pro adventu suo ibidem per litteram de priuato sigillo predictam (i.e. of May 10, 1370), lx arcus depictas.*"

³ *Ib.* 316/15, gives admirable examples under all these heads.

⁴ *Ib.* 392/14. Rothwell had but 22 "*lorice*" to all these thousands of bows and arrows.

⁵ *Ib.* 400/14.

many different pieces of armour; various engines for siege purposes; tents and standards; tools for manufacturing and repairing weapons; raw material, like wood for bows and spears, hemp for bowstrings, hides to cover the quivers used by horse archers, and so on.

The proportion of the different articles contained in the inventories varied widely at different times. Towards the end of our period bows and arrows loomed less largely than earlier, and greater stores of armour seem to have been kept. When Hatfield, in 1381, delivered to Hermesthorpe a small store of arrows, he transferred to him 1469 breast-plates, 77 cross-bows, 21,100 cross-bow bolts and 8100 caltraps.¹ All these and similar particulars supply abundant material for the study of the military equipment of the period, and of the early use of guns and gunpowder in England.²

That gunpowder was employed as early as 1333-34 for military purposes, is practically certain from the earliest chamber account of John Fleet. In March or April, 1346, "powder for engines" was actually being manufactured in the Tower, and was soon produced on quite a large scale, for between May 1346 and September 1347, we find no less than 3683 lbs. of saltpetre and 1662 lbs. of quick sulphur were provided by the great wardrobe to meet the needs of Thomas Rolleston and his powder makers at the Tower. The manufacture of guns went on side by side with that of gunpowder. In February 1345 the king ordered all the guns and cannon balls in the Tower to be shipped beyond sea for his projected expedition. In October of the same year Mildenhall was ordered to make, for "the king's passage to Normandy," a hundred "ribalds" or "ribaudequins." These were small barrels assembled together, mounted on a portable wheeled carriage, and discharging as their missiles "quarrels," similar in type to the bolts of a cross-bow. By the

¹ *E.A.* 400/14. See above, p. 469. Compare these with Rothwell's 22 "lorice" in 1360; p. 469, n. 4.

² In *E.H.R.* xxvi. 688-702, I have published the chief passages in the chamber, privy wardrobe and great wardrobe accounts, and also some passages from the issue rolls, illustrating the use of firearms and gunpowder in England, down to the deposition of Richard II. It will be enough here to give a general reference to those extracts, and to the article on "Firearms in England in the Fourteenth century" (*ib.* pp. 666-688), which I put together by way of introduction to them.

spring of 1346 the "ribalds" and "quarrels" had been made within the Tower itself by the king's own workmen, and paid for. Though it is not clear that the "ribalds" were used on the Crécy campaign for which they had been designed, it is certain that they were used at the siege of Calais, and it is equally certain that guns, balls and gunpowder were shipped in March 1346 for the king's voyage to Normandy. There is, therefore, every reason for accepting the statement of four independent chroniclers, that cannon were used by the English at the battle of Crécy. Ten guns at least, two of which were described as "great guns," were employed at the siege of Calais and were manned by twelve gunners.

Between the fall of Calais in 1347 and the treaty of Calais in 1360, there is, in the privy wardrobe accounts, only one reference to firearms. That was made when William Rothwell recorded, between 1353 and 1360, the purchase of four guns of brass, and the provision of a pestle and mortar for making gunpowder. When Henry Snaith came into office in 1360, he found left in the Tower by his predecessor four guns, with 16 lbs. of powder and a pestle and mortar. Though Snaith's years of office were years of peace, he added to his stock five guns by purchase, and also one very small gun, which Edward III. presented to his son, Lionel of Antwerp, when he sent him to reduce Ireland to order. The large sums he paid to the king's apothecary, William Staines, showed that money for munitions had long been overdue to that merchant, and that large supplies of saltpetre and sulphur had been provided by him, before 1367, for the defence of Calais.¹

During John Sleaford's keepership the privy wardrobe first concerned itself with firearms on a great scale. It provided no less than twenty-nine iron guns for the abortive expedition of 1372, the last military enterprise in which Edward III. aspired to take a personal share, and the first in which an English force was adequately equipped with firearms. A gunnery department was growing up in the privy wardrobe under John Derby, clerk of the king's guns, whose account for his office, ranging from 1370

¹ *E.A.* 395/8. A barrel of saltpetre and one of "live sulphur" were sent to the captain of Calais, John Beauchamp, "pro municione castri." William Staines had been in business much earlier, supplying, for instance, large quantities of "great wardrobe" commodities in the days of Cross and Fleet, that is by 1343; *ib.* 398/12.

to 1374, is still extant.¹ Sleaford was much employed in equipping the chief English fortresses with modern artillery. He sent eleven guns to Queenborough in Sheppey, and six guns to Dover castle. In the year 1369-70 there were three great guns of brass, one of iron and fifteen other guns at Calais, and to these another was added in 1372. By 1375 there was a special officer, William Newlyn, acting as *magister gunnorum regis ville Calesie*. In the years of renewed warfare, the activity in the Tower workshops was faithfully reflected in the privy wardrobe accounts. When Sleaford gave up office, there were still twenty-two guns at the Tower, in store or in position. Our business here is only with the Tower wardrobe, but there were, of course, other sources from which cannon and ammunition could be procured.

The lethargy of the privy wardrobe in the early years of Richard II.'s reign was shown in the diminution of its store of firearms and ammunition as well as in its reduced finances. Of the twenty-two guns which keeper Hatfield² received from Sleaford in 1378, only eleven were in the Tower when he retired in September 1381. Two of the missing eleven had been sold, and two, as we have seen, had been stolen in June 1381 by the revolted peasants. The only remedy which keeper Hermesthorpe provided against the repetition of such a disaster was the strengthening of the doors and locks, and the purchase of a little gunpowder. Randolph Hatton, who succeeded Hermesthorpe in May 1382 and remained in office till 1396, energetically replenished the Tower stores. Though he never enjoyed the income of Edward III.'s keepers, he devoted so much of what he had to the provision of munitions that, under him, the gunnery department of the privy wardrobe assumed unprecedented dimensions. Between 1382 and 1388 Hatton spent nearly £1800 on such purchases. He bought eighty-seven cannon from four gun-founders, and, despite the large number of guns dispatched to various fortresses, his executors, after his death, handed over to his successor a stock of more than fifty pieces of artillery. When he came into office there was no gunpowder, and only 80 lbs. of

¹ The "particule compoti Johannis de Derby," Mar. 1, 1370, to Mar. 30, 1374, is printed in *Archæologia*, xxxii. 386-387. I have not included this among the documents printed in the *E.H.R.*

² John Hatfield had been "clericus nauium regis" in June 1370, and therefore long connected with the Tower wardrobe; *E.A.* 396/16.

saltpetre in store: at his death there were in reserve nearly 4000 lbs. of gunpowder and 600 lbs. of saltpetre.

The copious details given in Hatton's accounts illuminate every aspect of the early history of firearms, and show the important part played by the privy wardrobe in their manufacture and repair, as well as in their storage and distribution. Though the Tower wardrobe was not a cannon factory to any large extent, the king's *artiller*, his smith and his carpenter, constituted a small permanent staff at the Tower, able to repair and to construct cannon. Yet, when William Byker, the king's *artiller*, or Stephen atte Marsh, the king's smith, manufactured a gun, payment for it was made as to any outside workman. On Hatton's instructions, William Woodward, a London founder, made, in five years, seventy-three cannon for the privy wardrobe. Like other early gun-founders, Woodward not only cast the guns but made the *telaria*, that is, the "tillers," or gun stocks, on which they were placed. The makers of gun and carriage also rounded the big stones used as missiles for guns of high calibre, cast the "pellets," or balls, for smaller cannon, and fashioned the "quarrels," which were still considered the appropriate shot for guns of the smallest size. They also prepared the wooden "tampions," the "firing-pans," the "touches," and the "drills" used in charging the gun. Very often also they provided the gunpowder, or at least the two costly constituents of that article, saltpetre and sulphur.

By Hatton's days the primitive small gun had been developed in both directions. At one end of the scale was the mighty weapon, constructed by Woodward, weighing seven hundred-weight,¹ and apparently eleven-barrelled. The central barrel threw large stones, and was surrounded by ten small barrels, which projected "quarrels," or leaden bullets of modest size. This, however, was an exceptional piece. A more useful weight for a great cannon was evidently about 380 lbs.,² since Byker cast no less than forty-seven cannon of this type. A cannon of 181 lbs.

¹ Woodward usually mentioned whether the "centena" was of 100 or 112 lbs., but here did not. He generally, however, reckoned by the cwt. of 112 lbs.; *E.H.R. u.s.* pp. 697-698.

² I give this weight on the hypothesis that the weight of all the cannon, viz. 15,967 lbs., where the hundred amounted to 112 lbs., adds up to 17,875 lbs.; but all manipulations of mediaeval numbers can only be done with fear and trembling.

was also a "great cannon," and fired stones. "Small cannon," cast by Woodward, averaged 43 lbs. each, and threw pellets of lead or "quarrels." It is in Hatton's account that hand-guns are first mentioned by name, though there were apparently only four of them.¹ For such hand-guns the appropriate stand was an iron bound staff of wood, called a *baculus*. The larger cannon of this period were breech-loaders, and often provided with movable breaches or chambers, made in duplicate, but it is hard to distinguish between cannon provided with a duplicate chamber and guns having two or more barrels. In the fourteenth century guns were cheap, costing on the average about fourpence a lb., but they were dearer than armour, except armour of steel. Gunpowder cost much more than guns; saltpetre was very rare and was worth from eighteen to fifteen pence a lb., while sulphur averaged from eightpence to sixpence a lb. Charcoal, on the other hand, was so cheap that its price is seldom recorded.

The privy wardrobe accounts suggest that, contrary to general opinion, both guns and ammunition were constructed by Englishmen, Londoners for the most part, and that in England. They also bring out clearly the gradual process by which firearms became as efficient as the ancient types of artillery, such as the *balista* and the *petraria*, the long bow and the cross-bow. The *artiller*, who before 1340 was a specialist in bows and arrows, cross-bows and bolts, and the clumsy ancient machines worked by counterpoise, or by torsion, by this time included firearms within his province. Especially intimate is the connection between early cannon and the larger type of *balista*, or arbalest, a much heavier weapon than the ordinary cross-bow used by an individual soldier in the field. When there was a commercial demand for firearms and ammunition, men skilled in making *baliste* turned their attention to the construction of the newer weapon, and were only slowly superseded by professional gun-founders, like Woodward. Naturally, in a period of experiment, the accounts bear witness to many failures, and to many pieces broken, used up or destroyed. Even at the end of our period

¹ "iiiij parue canones de cupro vocate handgonnes"; *ib.* p. 699. The widely spread error that there were hand-guns on an English ship in 1338 rests on Sir Harris Nicolas having assigned to that year a document which really belongs to 1411; *ib.* pp. 668-669.

the differentiation of the gun-founder and the arbalast maker was by no means complete.

The proportion of the old and new types of weapon, used at the end of the fourteenth century, is well brought out in Lowick's last account, which records the stock at the Tower at the moment of Richard's deposition. Lowick had in his possession 1353 bows, 2568 sheaves of headless arrows, 15 gross 2 dozen bowstrings, 500 lances without heads and 60 hatchets of war. He also had in stock 39 cannon of brass and iron, 23 "trunks" for cannon, 800 round stones, 848 lbs. of lead in pellets, 126 lbs. of gunpowder, 108 lbs. of saltpetre, 14 firepans of iron, and 4 moulds for casting bullets.¹

Although the privy wardrobe was now a gun and gunpowder factory, it continued to be a workshop for the repair and manufacture of arms and armour. Indeed the accounts suggest that the Tower workshops were primarily engaged in repairing, and in assembling the various parts of implements, purchased or secured in a raw or half manufactured state. Wood was bought for making bows and arrows, hide for covering quivers, leather for saddlery, barrels for packing arrows and bolts, hutches in which to pack cross-bows, hemp and hair for making bow-strings, and the ingredients of gunpowder.² Heads were put to arrows, and strings to bows; sulphur, charcoal and saltpetre were combined to make gunpowder; and sulphur, oil and bran were used for cleaning armour. Gradually the armourers and tentmakers, originally attached to the great wardrobe, were attracted to the privy wardrobe, a step in that direction being taken when, besides pavilioner Yaxley, who was attached to the great wardrobe, clerks of the Tower wardrobe, Rolleston and Mildenhall for instance, acted *in officio pavillonarii regis*.³ By Edward III.'s death the transference was nearly complete.

In the reign of Richard II. armourers in the Tower received from the constable houses in which to live and to work.⁴ The

¹ *Enr. Accts.* F. 1 Hen. IV. H. Lowick had taken considerable stores to Ireland in 1399 and left them there: but they were delivered to the great wardrobe after Henry IV.'s succession; *C.C.R.*, 1399-1402, p. 79. Cf. above, p. 466.

² An early instance of the purchase of these is in *E.A.* 391/1.

³ *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/34d, 42.

⁴ *E.A.* 396/15. A letter of July 27, 1377, informing Sleaford that the king had ordered the constable of the Tower to deliver to William Snell, the king's armourer, the houses in the Tower which he had occupied "si bien pur sa

king's armourer of the Tower, receiving wages at 1s. a day, had power to "choose and set to work as many workmen as he shall need for armour-making and the carriage thereof."¹ Under him there were usually a yeoman at 6d. and a groom at 3d. In 1389, a bowyer by trade was made yeoman of the Tower wardrobe.² There were, too, the king's smith in the Tower³ and the king's maker of cross-bows, who was paid 6d. a day.⁴ Between 1373 and 1375 a workman was engaged to make powder and balls of lead for guns, at the Tower, for twelve days at a wage of 6d. a day.⁵ A little later another workman was employed in making "great quarrels" for cross-bows, within the chamber of the privy wardrobe.⁶

The more difficult processes of manufacture seem seldom to have been attempted in the Tower workshops. In 1380 Richard II. made the large grant of 1s. a day to Richard Davy, "who has lived in Lombardy and there learnt the mistery of making breast-plates," and had been "ordered to stay in the Tower of London for the purpose of making them for the king's use and instructing others therein."⁷ But I have not noticed any clear evidence of the manufacture of cannon within the privy wardrobe, although, in 1339, John Fleet was instructed to pay arrears of wages to William le Gynour "for the time when he was in the king's service in the Tower in making engines and springalds."⁸ The sphere of the privy wardrobe as a factory is indicated in a writ of aid of June 4, 1378, for the keeper, John Hatfield, to take as many

demoere come pur louorage des armes de nostre dit sire et ael." Snell, king's yeoman, had been appointed on July 17 "to the office of the king's armourer of the Tower"; *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 61.

¹ *Ib.* p. 61. In 1378 the yeoman of the king's armour of the Tower was also made keeper of the king's lions there; *ib.* p. 139.

² *Ib.*, 1388-92, p. 41.

³ *Ib.*, 1377-81, p. 137.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 137, "artillarius balistarum." Cf. Ducange s.v. The "artillator" was a man "qui faciat balistas, carellos, arcus, sagittas, lanceas, spiculas, et alia arma necessaria pro garnizionibus castrorum."

⁵ *E.A.* 397/10: "Et unius operarii ad vid. per diem pro xij diebus operationis opere facture pulueris et pelottes de plumbo pro gunnis apud Turrin London."

⁶ *Ib.* 397/19: "Super factura magnorum harnesiorum pro balistis infra cameram priuate garderobe super aquam pendentem."

⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 458. The entry suggests he was an Englishman who had learnt his art in Lombardy, in spite of the index reference in *ib.* 696. Davy is more likely than the "Dany" of the Calendar.

⁸ *C.C.R.*, 1339-41, p. 179. "Gynour" (*i.e.* engineer) seems a more probable form than the "Gyvour" of the Calendar.

fletchers, smiths for making arrow heads, bow makers, armourers and furbishers, "as may be necessary for the works of the Tower, with power to arrest and imprison the disobedient." ¹

Large purchases could not be made with the small means of the privy wardrobe. A considerable proportion of the warlike apparatus that reached the Tower was bought, at the king's command, by sheriffs, mayors and other local officers, paid for from the revenues of their bailiwicks, and delivered, ready for use, to the keeper of the Tower wardrobe. Such orders were sure to be issued whenever an expedition to France required the provision of additional array, or dangerously reduced the Tower stocks. Thus on November 8, 1359, soon after Edward III. had started on that invasion of northern France which brought about the treaty of Brétigni, writs were issued to twenty-one sheriffs of thirty shires, instructing them to provide and deliver to Rothwell at the Tower of London, by December 7, a certain number of sheaves of arrows, "well-pointed," and some "white bows" and "painted bows." ² If the sheriffs could not secure the arms before the date named, they were to send to the receipt of the exchequer, on that day, equivalent sums of money, since the king required "a great number of bows and arrows speedily for the furtherance of his war with France."

The order was executed with true mediaeval slackness. More than two months after the date fixed, only seven sheriffs in charge of eleven shires, had obeyed the royal writ, fourteen sheriffs of nineteen shires being still in arrears. Accordingly, on February 24, 1360, each of the defaulting sheriffs was ordered, on pain of a fine of £40, to produce at the exchequer the amounts previously specified as alternative to the arms to be furnished by April 13, "that therewith the king may content his clerk, William of Rothwell, keeper of his wardrobe, for the bows and arrows by

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 230. Even ampler phrases are in later writs, as for example, that in aid of Simon Fleet on Mar. 26, 1408; *ib.*, 1405-8, p. 474. The appointment of Henry Somer on June 15, 1406, is couched in essentially the same language; *ib.* p. 192.

² *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, pp. 601-602; *Foedera*, iii. 454. The arms asked for were 600 white bows and 600 painted bows from Lincoln and Gloucester, and 12,000 sheaves of arrows from all the shires. The money exacted as an alternative amounted in all to £963 : 15 : 8. The sums clearly bear no proportion to the resources of the shires. It is significant that the local authorities were only asked to provide the simpler and more old-fashioned types of arms.

him bought and purveyed, as the sheriff did not have those bows and arrows bought and purveyed of the issues of his bailiwick at the Tower of London on the 7th December last.”¹ We need not be surprised that every effort was made to exact from the local officers the sums thus disbursed by the keeper, for Rothwell’s income from the exchequer was not much more than half the value of the arms required from the sheriffs. It looks as if many of the direct purchases of the keeper of the Tower wardrobe were only made when the local agents of the crown failed.

Another source of privy wardrobe arms and armour was the capture of enemy property. Thus, in 1346, nine coffers of *armature* came to the Tower from Caen, doubtless the spoils of the successful siege of that town.² Before the end of the year these were, by the king’s orders, sent to the army besieging Calais. The Tower armoury was also replenished by the forfeited weapons and armour of rebels, as for instance, in 1398, when the armour of the duke of Gloucester and the earls of Arundel and Warwick was delivered to the keeper of the armoury in the Tower.³

The fact that keepers of the privy wardrobe had to pay nothing for a large number of the weapons in their custody, had the happy result of leaving them enough money to buy such as could not be procured otherwise, and to maintain their workshops. Purchase of arms and armour took place frequently. The accounts of a royal armourer, such as John of Cologne (1333–54), showed him constantly receiving payments from and delivering arms to such privy wardrobe officers as Fleet, Mildenhall and Rolleston.⁴ Even the restricted scale of Snaith’s peace account, for the years 1362–66, allowed him to buy 30 *lorice* at 24s. each, and others of an inferior quality at 17s. each.⁵ The documents subsidiary to the privy wardrobe accounts contain numerous receipts of arrows and other arms delivered by various makers to the Tower,⁶ and from the lists of *empciones* long catalogues could be made of the goods bought.

¹ *C.C.R.*, 1360–64, pp. 10–11. Among the defaulters were the sheriffs of Lincoln and Gloucester, from whom the largest sums, namely, £145 : 16 : 8 and £109 : 11 : 8, were to be exacted ; but the sheriff of Kent was also in default, though only for £49 : 11 : 8, and the sheriff of Hampshire for £21 : 5 : 0.

² *Pipe*, 198/34 d, 27 Ed. III.

³ *Kal. and Invent. of Exchequer*, iii. 307.

⁴ *Pipe*, 207/51, 36 Ed. III. Cologne was an officer of the great wardrobe ; see above, pp. 389–391.

⁵ *E.A.* 394/14.

⁶ See, for example, documents in *ib.* 396/15.

The premises occupied by the privy wardrobe in the Tower are not clearly indicated by the records. There was a *camera regis* in the Tower, which seems to have been its special preserve,¹ yet often the arms appear to have been stored, and their manufacture and repair carried on, in any momentarily convenient spot. In Fleet's day certain apartments were furnished with partitions and shelves, covered with cloth, provided by the great wardrobe, for the use of the king's arms and armour,² but later, the stores must often have overflowed into other parts of the Tower. The development of workshops for the wardrobe must also have made great demands on the space available, for the king's armourers and other craftsmen had their *hospicia* within the Tower. In Hatton's time, rounded stones for cannon balls were stored, and perhaps even fashioned, in the great hall of the Tower, and whenever the king or queen paid visits to the Tower, clearances of such encumbrances had to be made for their accommodation. Thus, when Richard II. went to the Tower, to spend Christmas in 1387, the piles of stone cannon balls were hastily removed from the great hall to a certain small tower, hard by the *hospicium* of William Byker, the armourer.³ We have also seen that when Anne of Bohemia came to England in 1382, the queen's *camera* in the Tower had to be cleared of chests of armour, which eighteen men carried to the "great tower beyond the Watergate."⁴ Such casual methods of safeguarding the contents of the privy wardrobe made it easy for the peasants in 1381 to take away a large quantity of the stores.⁵ The most direct reference to locality is the mention of the chamber of the privy wardrobe hanging over the water.⁶ Was this the "great tower beyond the Watergate" referred to above?

The history of the privy wardrobe in the Tower after 1399

¹ See above, p. 448, n. 3.

² *Enr. Acc. (W. and H.)* 3/33: "Et eidem Johanni de Flete, ad quasdam parietes et tabulas cooperiendas super quas et ad quas armature regis ponebantur apud Turrin London."

³ *E.A.* 400/23: "Et in vadiis vnus cementarii operantis super rotundacione lapidum pro gonnis, et remocione et portagio eorundem de magna aula infra Turrin predictam vsque quandam paruam turrin ibidem juxta hospicium Willelmi Byker, contra aduentum regis ibidem ad festum Natiuitatis, anno xi°." Byker was also a gunsmith.

⁴ See above, p. 465.

⁵ See above, pp. 459-461.

⁶ See above, p. 476, n. 6.

can be briefly summarised.¹ The office was never more active than under Henry IV., when its transactions were on an exceptionally large scale, the issues amounting in one term to £1622.² The accounts run continuously until 1408, but there they end abruptly.³ The last accounting keeper was Henry Somer, who passed from the service of the privy wardrobe to be baron, and ultimately chancellor, of the exchequer. Of him we shall hear again as the friend and patron of the privy seal clerk, Thomas Hoccleve, the poet.⁴ After 1407, not only are the accounts wanting, but all reference to them. Yet the disappearance of the accounts did not involve the disappearance of the institution.⁵

For the whole of the fifteenth century the succession of keepers of the privy wardrobe can be traced on the patent rolls.⁶

¹ The fifteenth century privy wardrobe is not to be confused with the king's little, petty or small wardrobe in the Tower, whose keeper was concerned with the comparatively humble task of "keeping the king's beds and other things within the Tower," in no way connected with the privy wardrobe in the Tower; *C.P.R.*, 1422-29, p. 537; *ib.*, 1436-41, p. 351; *ib.*, 1441-46, p. 281; *ib.*, 1446-52, pp. 223-224, 522; *ib.*, 1452-61, p. 442; *ib.*, 1461-67, p. 186.

² Sir James Ramsay, in the *Antiquary*, vi. 106, states that the issues for Easter term, Apr. 23-Sept. 4, 1403, amounted to £1622 : 18 : 2½.

³ *P.R.O. Lists and Indexes*, xi.; *Enr. Foreign Accounts*, p. 106.

⁴ See later, vol. v. ch. xvi.

⁵ In *Antiquary*, viii. 97, Sir James Ramsay says that "the special features of Henry V.'s accounts are the disappearance of the private wardrobe, an account for arms kept at the Tower, and the largeness of the drawings of the chamber." These two latter features might perhaps suggest the former, but the whole statement is ambiguous.

⁶ The following is a list of the keepers and the dates of their appointment, with the authorities :

HENRY IV. AND HENRY V.

John Norbury, king's esquire.	Nov. 5, 1399.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1399-1401, pp. 122, 448.
Henry Somer, king's sergeant.	Feb. 13, 1405.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1401-5, p. 489.
Simon Fleet, king's esquire.	Dec. 4, 1407.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1405-8, p. 387; <i>ib.</i> , 1422-29, p. 75.

HENRY VI.

Gilbert Parr, usher of the chamber.	Apr. 16, 1430.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1429-36, pp. 56, 79, 118; <i>ib.</i> , 1436-41, p. 175; <i>ib.</i> , 1441-46, p. 221.
Thomas Thorp.	Nov. 16, 1457.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1452-61, p. 392.
John Parr, esquire.	Oct. 2, 1460.	<i>ib.</i> , p. 624.

EDWARD IV.

John Sidborough, king's sergeant.	July 24, 1461.	<i>C.P.R.</i> , 1461-67, p. 127; <i>ib.</i> , 1467-77, p. 480.
Robert Allerton, usher of the chamber.	June 9, 1476.	<i>ib.</i> p. 590.

They were then commonly called "master keepers," to distinguish them from the subordinate keepers acting under them, and were usually esquires, sergeants and ushers of the chamber.¹ They were appointed for life, "with the appurtenant fees, wages and profits, houses and easements,"² and their salary of 1s. a day³ was payable out of the fee farm of London by the sheriffs of that city,⁴ or from the issues of the counties of London and Middlesex,⁵ or from the issues of the counties of Essex and Hertford.⁶

Were these ever keepers of the wardrobe in the Tower? A definite answer to that question is not forthcoming. Some light is thrown on the problem by a writ of February 18, 1436, which shows that the main function of the keepers of the Tower wardrobe had already passed to the keeper of the king's armour in the Tower. That writ states that from July 3, 1423, the date on which John Malpas had been appointed keeper of the king's armour in the Tower of London, with wages at the hands of the keeper of the privy wardrobe, the master keepers had not received "any money, or assignments of money, from any treasurer of England to provide armour, artillery, or anything else to pay wages since that date."⁷ Arrangements, therefore, were made for Malpas to receive his wages from the issues of the county of Kent, and presumably the privy wardrobe was not, in future, held responsible for the payment of such charges. No reason is given for the "master keepers' " lack of funds, but there we have the explanation of the inactivity of the privy wardrobe. All its supplies had come to an end. The "master keepers" became little more than pensioners, with no revenues at their disposal, no obvious duties to discharge and no real relation to the Tower. The important men were the keepers of the king's armour in the Tower, so that while, in effect, the privy wardrobe was the

¹ Thomas Thorp is the only one whose status is not given. See note 6 on p. 480.

² Gilbert Parr's first appointment was "during pleasure," but it was renewed "for life" on June 2, 1438; *C.P.R.*, 1436-41, p. 175.

³ This was the stipulated amount from 16 Henry VI. (1437-38); the same sum had probably been paid earlier.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1429-36, pp. 56, 118.

⁵ *Ib.*, 1441-46, p. 221; *ib.*, 1452-61, pp. 392, 624.

⁶ *Ib.*, 1461-67, p. 127; *ib.*, 1467-77, p. 590.

⁷ *Ib.*, 1422-29, p. 106; *ib.*, 1429-36, pp. 539-540.

armoury of the Tower,¹ the keepers of that armoury, unable to obtain their wages from their nominal chief, had to seek for them elsewhere.

Here we may take up again the story of the "removing" privy wardrobe of the household, from the point when, after Fleet's death, it had become quite separate from the wardrobe in the Tower. One result of the setting up of the Tower organisation was that this itinerating wardrobe never attained importance. Its main function was to look after the arms, robes and jewels in use, which from time to time were doled out to it from the Tower, or elsewhere. Doubtless this wardrobe was the one which suffered loss from fire at Antwerp in 1340 and again during the siege of Calais in 1347, calamities in which various military arms were consumed.² We can just trace in the records occasional references to the officers of this department, both clerical and lay. This privy wardrobe of the king's household was the office of which Henry Snaith, whose later history we have already traced, was clerk in 1359.³ It may also have been the same as the "privy wardrobe of the chamber," to which the great wardrobe so constantly made liveries, and may perhaps as well be identified with the *garderoba robarum regis*, whose transport required six carriages when Roger Smale took it, in 1367, from Windsor to Shipton.⁴ Among the later occupants of the same office under Richard II. there seem to have been Hubert Flory, who was described as clerk of the privy wardrobe in 1385,⁵ and William Pirie, acting in 1390 and 1391.⁶ To add to this list

¹ *C.P.R.*, 1399-1401, pp. 152, 214, 336; *ib.*, 1401-5, p. 510; *ib.*, 1405-8, p. 474; *ib.*, 1422-29, pp. 465, 467.

² See above, p. 103, n. 1; p. 106, n. 1; p. 116, n. 1. ³ *C.C.R.*, 1354-60, p. 574.

⁴ *E.A.*, 396/2, E. 1d, and F. 1. Cf. *ib.* 386/15, which records the cost of watching the privy wardrobe when it was sent from Newcastle to Clipstone. In 1353, it apparently spent a few weeks in the Tower, for *E.A.* 392/12, records that to J. Westle, "misso de Sarum vsque Turrim Lond' ad custodiendum garderobam robarum et armorum regis ibidem," were paid wages for forty days.

⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1385-89, p. 39. Flory is described as "king's esquire" and "clerk of his privy wardrobe." Already a "clerk" in the official sense, might be a layman in the technical sense.

⁶ *Ib.*, 1388-92, p. 276, where he is called "clerk of the king's privy wardrobe," and his wages of 7½d. a day are ordered to be paid from the ulnage of cloth for sale, in lieu of the same sums hitherto paid by the treasurer of the household. In *ib.* p. 475 Pirie is called "clerk of the privy wardrobe of the chamber." Compare *C.C.R.*, 1389-92, p. 215, where Pirie has a grant in 1390, "for his good service in the king's chamber."

would be easy, but hardly worth while. It is enough to say that down to the end of the reign of Henry VIII. there was still in existence this "removing wardrobe" which was "attendant upon the king, wherever he shall happen to be."¹

Besides the privy wardrobe in the Tower, other localised privy wardrobes sprang up during the fourteenth century, though these were as little important as the itinerating wardrobe itself. The one we read most about was "the privy wardrobe of the king within the palace of Westminster," whose clerk or keeper in 1368 was John Sleaford, the keeper of the privy wardrobe in the Tower.² In 1369 and 1370 John Thornton was keeper of this wardrobe, receiving a grant of 8d. a day at the exchequer "as well for his wages in the office aforesaid as for the wages of a boy attendant upon him in the aforesaid office."³ John Eyre, a man of infirm health, was the custodian in 1390.⁴ Besides the Westminster wardrobe, there were the king's wardrobe at York, the wardrobes within the castles at Leeds and Hadleigh,⁵ the privy wardrobe at St. Ives,⁶ and the king's wardrobe within the manor of Eltham.⁷ Of another type were the king's wardrobes which were substantially depots of arms, like the Tower wardrobe. Conspicuous among them was the king's wardrobe within the town of Calais, whose *custos* in 1353 was Hugh the Engineer.⁸ In short, wherever the king had a house or a military centre, there he had or might have a wardrobe. Such wardrobes were little more than wardrobes in the modern sense. How numerous

¹ *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII.* xxi. 2, p. 386.

² *E.A.* 396/7, in one document of which, John Sleaford was described as "clerk of the privy wardrobe within the palace of Westminster," and "keeper of the king's vessels within his privy palace of Westminster."

³ *Brantingham's Roll*, pp. 117, 397. See also *I.R.* 436/17, 43 E. III. M. t. for Thornton as keeper of "*priuata garderobera domini regis infra palacium Westmon.*"

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1388-92, p. 279.

⁵ *Ib.*, 1377-81, p. 396. Cf. *E.A.* 394/16 grants of robes to William Warnham, "*custodi garderober regis infra castrum de Haddede . . . J. Wantynge custodi garderober regis infra castrum de Ledes.*"

⁶ *E.A.* 386/15.


⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1396-99, p. 3; *C.C.R.*, 1392-96, p. 510.

⁸ *E.A.* 392/14, a privy wardrobe account, noting receipt of arms "*de Hugone lengynour, custode garderober domini regis infra villam Calesie,*" on July 26, 1353. There was a store of armour kept at Shrewsbury. In 1377 the keeper of the king's armour in Wales was authorised to clean and repair such armour as was in his care; *C.P.R.*, 1377-81, p. 30.


they became can be seen in the curious inventory made by a commission early in the reign of Edward VI. of the wardrobes of Henry VIII.¹ This document mentions thirteen such local wardrobes, besides the "wardrobe of the robes," the "great wardrobe" and the "removing wardrobe."

¹ *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII.* xxi. 2, pp. 385-386. The original is *MS. Harl.* 1419.

END OF VOL. IV



UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG LIBRARY



3 1888 008 145 410